

THE Catholic MIND

44TH YEAR OF



No. 997

Vol. XLIV

On Peace and Reconstruction	1
Equal Rights Amendment	6
Atomic Age and American Education ..	9
Family Communion	22
Full Employment and Human Rights ..	24
Congressmen Visit Rome	32
The Editorial Mind:	33
The Right to Strike	34
Good and Bad Comics	34
Who Rules Poland?	35
Continental Masonry	37
Has Fascism Ended with Mussolini? ...	46
Truth and Tolerance	48
Man's Relation to the Land	51
Cooperatives and Poverty	60
Minimum Wages	63
A Message from Stalin	

JANUARY, 1946



BX801
C36
v.44

THOUGHT

Fordham University Quarterly

VOL. XX

DECEMBER, 1945

NO. 79

Soviet Russia and the Cordon Sanitaire

OSCAR HALECKI

The Postwar Inflation of Russian Power

FRANCIS S. CAMPBELL

National Sovereignty and World Unity

PETER BERGER

German Catholic Bishops' Protest

RUDOLPH ARBESMANN

About Our Good Neighbors

EDWIN RYAN

London Is a Place

LEONARD FEENEY

Newman as Poet

JOHN K. RYAN

Fourth Centenary of the Council of Trent

WILLIAM J. SCHLAERTH

An Approach to Karl Jaspers

JAMES COLLINS

Poems

DANIEL J. HONAN

-:-

JAMES E. TOBIN

Book Review Section

(More than 55 pages dealing with recent works in the fields of Current Issues, Education, History, Literature, Philosophy, Religion, Sociology.)

Gentlemen: Enclosed please find \$5.00 to cover one-year subscription to *Thought* or \$1.25 to pay for the current issue

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY AND STATE

(Please add postal unit)

THOUGHT • Fordham University • New York 58, N. Y.

THE CATHOLIC MIND, January, 1946. Volume XLIV. No. 997. Published by The America Press, Grand Central Terminal Building, 70 E. 45th Street, New York 17, N. Y. Subscription, postpaid. Yearly \$2.00; Canada and foreign, \$2.50; Single copy, 20 cents.

Entered as second class matter October 22, 1914, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Reentered as second-class matter January 20, 1943 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rates of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1913. Trade-mark "Catholic Mind" Reg. U. S. Pat. Off.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIV

JANUARY, 1946

NO. 997

On Peace and Reconstruction

Statement issued by the Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, November 17, 1945.

THE war is over but there is no peace in the world. In the Atlantic Charter we were given the broad outline of the peace for which we fought and bled and, at an incalculable price, won a great martial victory.

It was that ideal of peace which sustained us through the war, which inspired the heroic defense of liberty by millions driven underground in enslaved countries. It made small, oppressed nations confide in us as the trustee of their freedoms. It was the broad outline of a good peace.

Are we going to give up this ideal of peace? If, under the pretext of a false realism, we do so, then we shall stand face to face with the awful catastrophe of atomic war.

Since the Moscow conference of 1943, the United States, Great Britain and Russia have undertaken to shape gradually the peace which they are imposing on the nations. From the conferences of these victorious powers there is emerging slowly their pattern for the peace. It is disappointing in the extreme.

Assurances are given us in the announced peace principles of our country but so far results do not square with these principles. We are in perhaps the greatest crisis of human history. Our country has the power, the right and the responsibility to demand a genuine peace based on justice which will answer the cry in the hearts of men across the world.

We want to work in unity with other nations for the making of a good peace. During the war, perhaps, it may have been necessary for strategic reasons to postpone final decisions on many questions mooted at the conferences of the three great powers. Now we must face the facts.

7 Apr 48

144142

There are profound differences of thought and policy between Russia and the western democracies. Russia has acted unilaterally on many important settlements. It has sought to establish its sphere of influence in eastern and southeastern Europe, not on the basis of sound regional agreements in which sovereignties and rights are respected, but by the imposition of its sovereignty and by ruthlessly setting up helpless puppet states. Its Asiatic policy, so important for the peace of the world, is an enigma.

The totalitarian dictators promised benefits to the masses through an omnipotent police-state which extends its authority to all human relations and recognizes no innate freedoms. Their theories, moreover, look to the realization of world well-being as ultimately to be secured by the inclusion of all countries in their system.

Sometimes Russia uses our vocabulary and talks of democracy and rights, but it attaches distorted meanings to the words. We think in terms of our historic culture. We see God-given, inviolable human rights in every person and we know democracy as the free collaboration under law of citizens in a free country.

There is a clash of ideologies. The frank recognition of these differences is preliminary to any sincere effort in realistic world cooperation or peace. The basis of this cooperation must be mutual adherence to justice. It would be unjust for us to be an accomplice in violating the rights of nations, groups and individuals anywhere in the world.

A first step toward effective negotiation for peace is to have a plan. A good plan states principles in terms of all the specific questions at issue. Instead, so far we have compromised and sought to make mere piece-meal settlements.

RETURN TO POWER POLITICS

Instead of honest, promising discussion even on diverging plans, we are witnessing a return of the tragedy of power politics and the danger of balance-of-power arrangements which, with the substitution of mere expediency for justice, have begotten war after war. We must, indeed, aim at collaborating with all of our Allies in the making of a good peace. There are, however, concessions which we dare not make because they are immoral and destructive of genuine peace.

Our peace program envisions a world organization of nations. The Charter which emerged from the San Francisco Conference, while undoubtedly an improvement on the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, does

not provide for a sound, institutional organization of the international society. The Security Council provisions make it no more than a virtual alliance of the great powers for the maintenance of peace. These nations are given a status above the law.

Nevertheless, our country acted wisely in deciding to participate in this world organization. It is better than world chaos. From the provision in the Charter for calling a constituent assembly in the future, there comes the hope that in time the defects may be eliminated and we may have a sound, institutional organization of the international community which will develop, not through mere voluntary concessions of the nations, but from the recognition of the rights and duties of international society.

While peace is in the making, there are urgent issues which we can no longer evade. At Yalta we gave a pledge to the Polish people and assumed responsibility before the world that they would be unhampered in setting up their own independent, democratic government.

POLISH, BALKAN ISSUES

Are we working to the fulfillment of that pledge in the full measure of our responsibility and our power? What apology can be offered for the failure of the protagonists of democracy to protest the absorption by force and artifice of the Baltic countries into the Union of Soviet Republics?

We are shocked by the news which is leaking out from Slovakia, Croatia, Slovenia and other southeastern European countries. Religious persecution, which is both brutal and cunning, rages in many lands. No reason of policy justifies our silence. What is happening behind the blackout of eastern and southeastern Europe is a stark contradiction to the high ideals which inspired our fighting to save the world from totalitarian aggression.

No one can fail to see the importance of a reconstructed, revitalized Europe, which is the cradle of western culture. We deplore the tragic indifference to the plight of the Italian people who threw off the chains of a fascist regime, who fought side by side with us in ardent loyalty. For over two long years of agony the friends of democracy in that country have had to stand by in impotence while we have toyed with the vital problems of relief and rehabilitation and deferred the fulfillment of our own solemn promises.

Our own national interest, as well as the cause of world peace and

the fate of Christian culture, are at stake in Italy. Today it is an outpost of Western Civilization. We are fully confident that the Italian people, if we save them from despair by our helpful interest, will stand fast against the deceitful appeal of alien and subversive ideologies and shape their future in the spirit of their own noble Christian tradition.

We cannot be unconcerned about the future of Germany, Austria and Hungary. Whatever period of probation must be imposed on the vanquished nations, we must help them to take their rightful place in the family of nations. To treat them in a spirit of vengeance is neither right nor politic.

RELIEF URGED ON CONGRESS

Justice demands the punishment of the guilty and reasonable reparations of damage done. But we cannot forget, or allow our representatives to forget, that our traditional system of punitive justice is anchored to the concept of individual responsibility. The inhumanities which now mark the mass transference of populations, the systematized use of slave labor and the cruel treatment of prisoners of war should have no place in our civilization.

Acute suffering is the daily lot of whole populations in many war-torn lands. Every report indicates that, unless heroic measures are taken at once, millions will die from starvation and exposure during the coming winter. The feeding and clothing and sheltering of these suffering people is not a work which can be left to some future convenient date.

Our country, because of our greater resources, must do the major part of this work of relief. In it we have the right and duty to insist on the leadership which corresponds to our sacrifices and contributions. It is imperative that Congress make adequate appropriations for this work from the public treasury.

It is equally imperative that private relief agencies be given a full opportunity to carry on their beneficent work among all suffering peoples. And relief must envision something larger than merely feeding the starving and sheltering the homeless. Help must be given to peoples whose economies are ruined. They have the right to assistance in getting back to normal economic life. Neither the prosperity of the greater nations nor their might will prevent war unless conditions are removed in which poor, helpless peoples are denied the opportunity of a decent living standard. The world is one only in so far as men live together as brothers under God.

OUR GRAVE RESPONSIBILITY

Ours is a grave responsibility. The heart and hand of America are called upon in a way that is unique, not only in the history of our country but even in the annals of mankind. We know that democracy is as capable of solving the admittedly difficult problems of peace as it has shown itself in war. We must be true to ourselves. We must hold fast to our own free institutions. We must resolutely oppose the few among us who are trying to sabotage them. We may well pity those who in their half-veiled sympathy for totalitarianism are playing with the thought that perhaps in this great emergency its day is at hand. On bended knees let us ask God in His blessed Providence to help us to be the vigorous champion of democratic freedom and the generous friend of the needy and oppressed throughout the world.

*Atomic Energy and the UNO*

I have thought much of this business of atomic energy both before and since that bomb burst on Nagasaki, and for the life of me I have been unable to see—and I am still unable to see—any final solution that will make the world safe from atomic power other than that we all abate our present ideas of sovereignty. We have got somehow to take the sting out of nationalism. We cannot hope to do this at once. But we ought to start working for it now, and that I submit should be the first duty of the United Nations.

In the light of discoveries about atomic energy I think that the San Francisco Charter should be reviewed particularly with respect to the veto, which is an anachronism in the modern world.—*Anthony Eden in the House of Commons, November 22, 1945.*

Equal Rights Amendment

GEORGE E. REED

*Reprinted from CATHOLIC ACTION**

ON JULY 12 the House Committee on the Judiciary favorably reported a joint resolution proposing an "equal rights" amendment to the Constitution. The proposed amendment, which must be adopted by a two-thirds majority in both the House and the Senate before submission to the State legislatures for ratification, reads as follows:

That equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

This amendment shall take effect three years after the date of ratification.

The Report contained three separate Minority Views written by Representatives Celler, Hobbs and Russell, respectively. Representatives Thomas J. Lane, Martin Gorski, Michael A. Feighan and John Gwynne concurred in the Minority Views of Hon. Emanuel Celler, who stressed the confusion that the amendment would effect. Representative Celler stated:

The deceptive phrase of "equal rights" for women has earned for the amendment many adherents who do not see that such an amendment does not confer equal

rights. It brings the dubious gift of confusion and will boomerang in the form of unequal rights.

This is not alarmist prediction, for any attempt to confer equal rights upon men and women with their correlative equal duties constitutes an invitation to legal chaos, for the subjects of the amendment have basic differences which society must recognize. As Mr. Justice Frankfurter, while professor of Law at Harvard University so ably maintained at a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee on February 8, 1938:

The legal position of women cannot be stated in a single simple formula, because her life cannot be expressed in a single simple relation. Women's legal status necessarily involves complicated formulation because a woman occupies many relations.

These different relations spring naturally and spontaneously from the physical and psychological characteristics that differentiate the sexes — characteristics which condition legislation designed to safeguard the rights of women. Thus, every state has laws on its books which discriminate, but discriminate in favor of women that they may be adequately protected. Commenting on this type of legislation, Representative Sam Hobbs, in his Minority Views, stated that the

* 1312 Massachusetts Ave., Washington 5, D. C., August, 1945.

proposed amendment "would wipe out the righteous preferences now granted by many State laws."

"RIGHTEOUS PREFERENCES"

The term "righteous preferences" is a happily chosen one, for it serves to emphasize the present legal recognition of the difference in the sexes. The adoption of the amendment would no doubt result in the loss of these preferences and the retention of mere paper rights, for the legislation of the States establishing these legal preferences would be shorn of its constitutional basis. Legislation protecting the health and recognizing the dignity of women would be swept aside. The long and hard struggle to secure conditions of labor consistent with the physical and psychological makeup of women would be nullified. The public policy of the states with respect to the protection of women would bow to the power of the Federal Government. As Representative Hobbs observed:

The power here sought to be taken from the States is to regulate the home, the marriage relation, the welfare of children and parents, property rights of wives, widows and orphans, and the health, happiness and morals of most of the sovereign people.

To what extent these relationships would be affected would depend upon the decisions of the Federal Courts. However, the fact that any portion of the jurisdiction of the States over these relations will be transferred to

the Federal Government gives cause for concern. Thus, William F. Montavon, director of the Legal Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in his work on the "Equal Rights Amendment" stated as follows:

The fact remains that it has not been found possible to draft an equal rights amendment which would not require the abdication by the State of an essential part of its sovereign power to perform the general duties and powers of government which under the Constitution are reserved to the State and its people.

This indeed is an important consideration. Our system of government is constantly becoming more centralized. Economic necessity has dictated considerable centralization of activities in our Federal Government. There is no such necessity, however, for further depriving the States of their sovereign powers by the adoption of an "equal rights amendment." True, the Report of the Committee is characterized by frequent reference to the necessity of placing women on a plane of economic equality. Granted that there is a necessity for improving the economic bargaining power of women, still the problem is not so great that the States cannot meet it. As a matter of fact, the States of Michigan, Washington, Illinois, Montana and New York have recently enacted laws providing for equal pay for equal work. Legislative trends indicate that many more States will soon adopt such legislation—leg-

isolation which is much more desirable than an equal rights amendment, for it is an addition to the preferential status designed for the protection of women in industry. State legislation, therefore, gives women a greater economic bargaining power than they could hope to secure under the contemplated amendment. Forced to compete with men without the benefit of the equalizing factor of this protective legislation they would, in effect, have an unenforceable right as they would not be in the same bargaining position.

The third Minority View, that of Representative Samuel M. Russell, deals with the effect of the proposed amendment on the family. Thus he stated: "I am convinced it will be to the detriment of the family, home, community and to the women themselves."

This view reflects the best in Catholic teaching. For instance, Pope Pius XI in the Encyclical on Marriage observed:

The false liberty and unnatural equality with the husband is to the detriment of the woman herself, for if the woman

descends from her truly regal throne to which she has been raised within the walls of the home by means of the Gospel, she will soon be reduced to the old state of slavery and become as among the pagans the mere instrument of man. . . . This equality of rights, which is so much exaggerated and distorted, must indeed be recognized in those rights which belong to the dignity of the human soul and which are proper in the marriage contract and inseparately bound up with wedlock. In such things undoubtedly both parties enjoy the same rights and are bound by the same obligations; in other things there must be a certain inequality and due accommodation which is demanded by the good of the family and the right ordering and unity and stability of home life.

Observe the emphasis on the dignity of woman. Notice how it conforms with and is an expression of God-given rights. This is equality in the true sense of the word. Laws passed in harmony with it would of necessity redound to the benefit of women. Laws adopted on the basis of the spurious "equality" of the proposed amendment would violate the inalienable rights of woman to be treated in accordance with her God-given dignity.



Peace and Principle

Peace is not the mere absence of war. It is a positive condition of justice. It is the sister of charity and mercy. It is the offspring of honesty and truth.

It is the triumph of principle.—*Dorothy Thompson in the N. Y. Post, November 30, 1945.*

The Challenge of the Atomic Age to American Education

LOUIS J. A. MERCIER

Address before the Teachers' Alliance of New York City, November 10, 1945.

THIS ANNUAL MEETING of the New York Teachers' Alliance is, I was told, the renewal of a practice interrupted by the war. There is then no way of ignoring the fact that we are meeting here in a new spirit. We are all conscious that we are entering a new age. In this new age, we know, there will inevitably be a realignment of nations. We also know that this realignment must mean a society of nations or a new war. We further are soberly aware that with the advent of the atomic bomb a new war could mean the instantaneous wiping out of whole populations.

This should bring home to us that we can no longer afford to make fundamental mistakes, and that leaders in every field had better check up on their principles.

Your president kindly wrote me: "Our attitude on educational problems is neither that of the ultra-progressives, nor yet that of the old-line conservatives. Our hope is to synthesize the best elements of both into a constructive post-war policy for education. Something of the aspects of humanist philosophy as applied to elementary and secondary education

would be of interest to our group."

Let me say that no words could have struck a more responsive chord in my own mind. It was my privilege to be associated in the Francis W. Parker School of Chicago from 1906 to 1910 with teachers trained by Colonel Parker. This means a connection with the progressive movement from the days of Parker who began its development about 1875, some twenty-eight years before Dr. John W. Dewey became his successor for a year in 1903 at the University of Chicago. Once at Harvard, I became a departmental colleague of Irving Babbitt who was then developing his conception of humanism, and ever since I have been speaking or publishing on the questions which it raised. You may then be sure that no honor could have been more appreciated than the invitation to pursue the subject before New York teachers in a city where both progressivism and humanism have been so widely discussed.

What is progressivism? To us in Chicago, in the 1900's, I believe it meant teaching in terms of the child and not of the subject; in terms of growth from within through self-

effort motivated by the demands of that growth; so that the task of the teacher was to furnish the best conditions for the self-effort of all, and to keep constant tab on the consequent growth of each.

And yet this did not mean a self-centered child, for the self-development was to be a community enterprise for a community-end, a shared development. There were to be no rewards for the pupil save the sense of achievement for the common good, no respect asked by the teacher save that due to his or her knowledge, skills and helpfulness, no sanctions outside of the appeal—"are you doing everything to help and nothing to hinder?"

HUMAN PERSON AND THE STATE

Parker's progressivism was, according to his fervent hope, education for democracy. Parker repeatedly said: "I believe in democracy as I believe in God."

What is wrong about this progressivism? For my part I would say: there is nothing wrong about it. The psychological data on which it rests may be extended, its methodology is susceptible of constant improvement, but both are fundamentally sound. So, if the question is: "how to synthesize the best elements of old-line conservatism with this progressivism," then, it should easily be done, if we keep in mind that the development of skills, the formation of efficient

habits, requires the effort which the old education insisted on, as well as the interest emphasized by the new; and if we also ever remember that, though education should be in terms of the child, the child is in terms of a community with inheritances of knowledge and skills which must be transmitted and developed. The solution might then be expressed: a child-centered education for a community-centered child.

However, progressivism raises a much larger issue. It raises the question whether the child is merely in terms of the community. This is but part of the further question whether the citizen is to be merely a cog in the State or whether he stands as a human person, with inalienable rights before the State, and with the duty of recognizing a law higher than his own desire or the desire of the State, an antecedent righteousness which both he and the State must respect. This brings up the issue of the quality of our humanism, of our understanding of the nature of man, and of his relation to ultimate reality. Your president therefore raised the ultimate question when he suggested that we consider our educational problem in the light of humanism.

For of course we all know that early in this century it became evident that eventually the quality of our progressivism would depend upon the quality of our humanism. This became inevitable because the progres-

sivism of Parker was taken up by a powerful leader who was not only primarily a philosopher but the champion of a philosophy which so conceived the nature of man that he could have no higher end than society, because, for that philosopher, the ultimate reality was the evolution of society.

This was to run counter to the philosophy which built the western world. Parker's progressivism took for granted that age-old philosophy. Parker did not believe that the ultimate reality was the evolution of society. He believed that the ultimate reality was God the Creator. He believed that man had a God-given nature from which stemmed inalienable rights and abiding duties. He not only wrote: "I believe in democracy as I believe in God;" he also said: "Liberty is the right of all men, but freedom is an individual acquirement through search for God's laws and obedience to them."

But his successor in the development of progressivism did not believe in God the Creator. He actually wrote: "Faith in the divine author and authority in which Western civilization confided . . . inherited ideas of the soul and its destiny . . . have been made impossible for the cultivated mind of the Western world."

Why? we may ask. Because, according to this philosopher, we must believe in the philosophy of total change. We must give up all thought

of a reality antecedent to the universe. We must cease to believe in anything abiding within and above the flux of change. In short, we must cease to believe in *being*, we must believe only in *becoming*.

This was forcefully expressed in a manifesto published in 1933. "The time has passed," reads the manifesto, "for theism and deism . . . The universe is self-existing and not created . . . Man is a part of nature and has emerged as the result of a continuous process. . . .

Picked up by enthusiastic disciples, the principles of the master led to even more drastic variations on the **philosophy of total change**: "The old moorings of morals, religion, and philosophy," we were told, "no longer hold us fast . . . a new procedure must be found . . . we must help our youth to find the only real authority . . . of how it works when tried. Things do change, and we propose to hold to the consequent necessary right of question and revision."

How far may this question and revision go? Well, the master had already written: "Christianity which proffered a fixed revelation of absolute unchanging being and truth, elaborated into morals conceived as a code of laws, the same everywhere and at all times . . . is but an example of the extent of which ideas of fixity persist in a moving world."

This meant of course that the Christian code of morals did not

represent anything abidingly true, but at most a passing phase of the perpetual becoming. So another disciple of the master could readily add: "Our youth must be practiced in the attitude of expectancy of change, and therefore change in standards and norms of life, in standards of morality and family life."

REPUDIATION OF MORAL LAW

The philosophy of total change must necessarily speak thus; but it should be noted how necessarily also it compromised the progressivism of Parker. We are no longer to search for the laws of an antecedent reality, for God's laws, as Francis W. Parker still held, and lead our children to recognize the common sense and justice of those laws. We are, on the contrary, to tell them that all existing standards of morality may be flouted because they may be but outmoded conventions of an ever evolving society. Not only the ethical code of Christianity but even the Ten Commandments may go by the board. For there is no divine law, there is no natural law, there is to be only the day-to-day record of "how it works when tried." And why should we accept even how it worked when tried by others? If it failed for them, perhaps it will work for us.

This repudiation of an abiding moral law is so inexorably inevitable under the philosophy of total change that the most revered of our late

American jurists, who had come under the spell of that philosophy in its materialistic form, wrote: "Truth is the majority vote of the nation that could lick all others . . . Sovereignty is a form of power. The will of the sovereign is law because he has the power to compel obedience or punish disobedience, and for no other reason. When it comes to the development of a body of laws, the ultimate question is: What do the dominant forces of the community want, and do they want it hard enough to disregard whatever inhibitions may stand in the way?"

Well, that is what the Nazis said, that is what every totalitarian says, and yet that is what our still most influential American jurist said, because that is what we all must say and continue to say if we believe in the philosophy of total change.

The reason should be clear. If there is no antecedent reality, no God the Creator, no definite nature of man, no consequent definite relations with God and other men, then there can be no inalienable rights, and no universal and abiding justice. If what works when tried alone is true, that only will be true which I am strong enough to make work by whatever means. So we have inevitably, as our great American jurist pointed out, the principle that might is right so long as might lasts. It makes then no difference whether we are Germans, Japanese, Russians or Americans.

That is what we must believe if we believe in the philosophy of total change.

We are trembling today before the possibilities of the atomic bomb, before our actual capacity to dissolve the physical world. But we have working in our midst an even more fundamental destructive principle, because it dissolves metaphysical and moral reality, because it dissolves *being* into total *becoming*. This philosophic atomic bomb wiped out God from whatever centers it was accepted, but with God it wiped out the moral law based on the conception of the God-given nature of man. Hence our dilemma.

It would no doubt throw light upon that dilemma, if we now inquired, when did our philosophical atomic bomb start working? Let me try to do so briefly. We have but to recall the names of the militant Deists Voltaire and Rousseau to know that it was not yet prominently working in the middle of the 18th century. Voltaire even wrote: "If God did not exist, we would need to invent Him." And so believed the founders of this nation, so much so that nowhere is there a clearer statement of the dependence of the inalienable rights of man based on the conception of his God-given nature than in our Declaration of Independence.

But with the beginning of the 19th century, we see the philosophy of total change gathering strength. With

Hegel, we definitely leave behind the notion of being. Reality is now held to be a becoming, a realization of the Idea, developing through the struggle of opposites, and manifesting itself in individuals, institutions and nations. And immediately and logically we get the doctrine that might makes right. Hegel textually wrote: "In universal history each nation in turn is dominant. Against the absolute right to be the bearer of the present stage of the development of the world spirit, the spirits of the other nations are absolutely without rights, they count no longer in universal history."

Here is the kernel and seed of the doctrine of the superior race which led to the atrocities of the concentration camps. Taken up by German historians, it was expressed by the Frenchman Gobineau in his *Essay on the Inequality of Human Races*. It influenced Wagner. It passed to the English-born Houston Stewart Chamberlain who expounded it in his *Foundations of the XIXth Century*, preached it to William II, and lived long enough to encourage Hitler. Rosenberg, who in his *Myth of the Twentieth Century* formulated the Nazi doctrine, had read Chamberlain. The filiation is complete. There were, of course, economic reasons for the two world wars, but Nazism was born of this philosophy of the superior race representing the highest development of the total evolution. Marxism, too, is out of Hegel, and

stands for progress through struggle, the struggle between the classes, through coercion and liquidation. But, so, too, is our own version of the philosophy of total change.

The leader who told us that "the time has passed for Deism, and that belief in traditional morality is but an example of how fixed notions persist in a changing world," began as a Hegelian.

PHILOSOPHY OF TOTAL CHANGE

We may now perhaps see more clearly the nature of our dilemma; we can no longer agree as to what is the nature of man. As Americans, we still stand for the God-given nature of man as an inviolable human person ultimately responsible only to God, and hence we stand for the doctrine of inalienable rights before the State of all men and women whatever may be their race or color. But in so far as we have capitulated to the philosophy of total change we no longer believe in the God-given nature of man because we no longer believe in God the Creator. So as naturalistic educators, we are in contradiction with the fundamental American doctrine, we undermine that doctrine, and we stand helpless before the totalitarians who challenge that doctrine.

We propose to re-educate the Germans corrupted by Nazi doctrines. But as naturalists we cannot re-educate the Germans because our

creed comes from them, because they can read in our own naturalistic writings that "we can try anything to see if it will work," that "we should breed human stocks and decrease the productivity of poorer strains," that "we should have no superstitious dread of tampering with the question of who shall be born, or of fitting all men into an organized form for the welfare of the group," and that "the true measure of men is the total human energy which they embody and that the first test of their energy is battle in some form." All this, the Germans may tell us, we have believed in and carried out. Why, then, should you be shocked? why should you want to re-educate us when we have but followed principles your naturalists have made their own.

Helpless before the Germans, in so far as we are adherents of the philosophy of total change, we are still more helpless before the Russians who may say: We, too, are disciples of the philosophy you have accepted, and what is more, we are its most logical disciples.

Here, then, is the challenge of the atomic age to American education: in the age of the physical atomic bomb, can we any longer afford to keep the philosophical which leaves us the makers of our morality?

Must we not rid ourselves of the German importation which bred Nazism, and return to our American

tradition linked with the theistic philosophy which Christianity corroborated?

In the words of the late Senator Hoar of Massachusetts: "Our fathers laid deep the foundation of the State in the moral law. They first set to mankind the great example . . . of a great and free people voluntarily governing itself by a law higher than its own desire."

Is not this the saving formula which we should recover: the law higher than our own selfish and contradictory desires?

The question would then be: To the philosophy of total change, to monistic naturalism, must we not oppose anew at least a Theistic, dualistic humanism, a philosophy of the abiding in and above the changing, a philosophy which calls on us to recognize the universal and eternal reality of a moral law above our own passions and power?

If such is the issue, then the next question might be: Are there any signs that there is a possibility of our doing so? The answer is that there are most clearly such signs.

Most significant, first of all, is that the philosophy of total change is already dated, since strictly it belongs to the 19th century. The French began to repudiate it as early as the 1880's, though it remained at work among them and in Europe to their downfall. Renan and Taine had been its exponents, most unfortunately

since their genius might have stopped it in its tracks. But as early as the 80's there was a decided revolt against them with the publication of Bourget's *Essays of Contemporary Psychology*. It was almost immediately followed up by the powerful work of Brunetière, and by that of younger men, such as Psichari, the grandson of Renan, Péguy, Gilson and Maritain, the last two, at least, well-known in this country.

Our own awakening as to the possible fallacies of the philosophy of total change links with this French revolt, for Irving Babbitt, who first called on us to wake up, went to France in the 90's. At once he had seen the issue. He praised Brunetière for having "wrestled manfully with what is the central problem of contemporary thought, the problem how to adjust the rival claims of *being* and *becoming*." This task he took up for his own life's work. This task, he bequeathed to us. For of course there is *becoming*, there is constant change in the universe, in our world, in us. The real question is, however: Is there not also *being*, abiding principles of order, metaphysical and moral realities in and above the flux of change?

Babbitt stopped short of discussing metaphysical utilimates, but he reasserted tirelessly the need of distinguishing between the permanent and the impermanent. Speaking of the educational program of the phil-

osophers of total change, he wrote:

The notion that in spite of the enormous mass of experience that has been accumulated in both the East and West, we are still without light as to the habits that make for moderation and good sense and decency; and that education is therefore still purely a matter of exploration and experimentation is one that may be left to those who are suffering from an advanced stage of naturalistic intoxication. The child has the right to be introduced to the ethical cosmos, and not pitch-forked into chaos.

Just what are the essentials and ultimate principles of the ethical cosmos remained the question. Most curiously what now may be called the American dualistic humanism movement received a new impetus from an independent source, best represented by President Hutchins of Chicago. Many things have been said about President Hutchins. But no one can deny his utmost candor, since he is the only president on record who confessed that he was ignorant when he was inaugurated. At least his ignorance—even if exaggerated in the record—insured his looking at the educational situation with fresh eyes. Obligated to teach jurisprudence, he saw that no judge can be sure of the justice of his decision unless he knows what the nature of man is, for otherwise how could he know what one's relations to other men must be? Hutchins had thus rediscovered the necessity of metaphysics, for metaphysics is the science of being without which we cannot know how to distinguish

between kinds of beings, and hence without which we cannot know what man is, and his necessary relations to other beings. Metaphysics, Hutchins now saw, was the key to the ethical cosmos.

Whereupon he was quickly told by a representative of the philosophy of total change:

To stress first principles, as metaphysics does, without the constant challenge of experience is to produce intellectual conceits and reactionary attitudes . . . To substitute metaphysics for science is to arrest a process of intellectual growth that is at the basis of the democratic process.

To this, the dualistic humanist may answer: This is but a dogmatic begging of the question. Universal truths cannot be reactionary attitudes, because even if discovered in the past, they were always, are, and will always be true. No matter when first noted, it has always been, is, and will always be true that a being cannot be and not be at the same time, that a being is true only if in conformity with the ideal type of its nature, good only in proportion as it acts in accordance with that type, good for another only in so far as it corresponds to some exigency of the nature of that other.

EVIDENT TRUTHS

The knowledge of such truths really starts in experience, but it need not constantly be retested by experience because such truths are evident so soon as their terms are understood.

Physical scientific inquiry itself depends on such truths. It presupposes that physical beings are what they are and change only according to their antecedent potentialities of change. Metaphysical truth is the guarantee of physical truth, and far from being against the democratic process, it is, on the contrary, essential to the democratic process, for the democratic process, too, wholly depends upon metaphysical distinctions, distinctions between natures; since the inviolability and dignity of man which calls for democracy, depends upon his special nature; so much so that, so soon as you lose the metaphysical distinction of natures, and of the special nature of man, you are in danger of passing from democracy to totalitarianism.

Mr. Hutchins rediscovered this need of metaphysics, in all domains. But another typical American college man has gone even beyond Hutchins to proclaim the need of reasserting not only the need of metaphysics, but the highest pronouncement of metaphysics: the existence of God, distinct from, and antecedent to the universe. His name is Walter Lippmann.

His case is the more interesting in that no one has ever come out of college more bared of metaphysical beliefs than did Lippmann. Witness his *Preface to Morals* published in 1929. Nowhere can you find a more complete description of what he called "the dissolution of the ancestral

order." His earnest attempt in that book to save morals from the chaos wrought by the philosophy of total change was branded by Irving Babbitt as a failure because Lippmann's proposed morality was still merely personal pragmatic expediency. But in 1937, Mr. Lippmann published *The Good Society*. The last chapter of that book marks his emancipation from the philosophy of total change. He now calls those who were still under its spell "the lost generation," helplessly living in a meaningless chaos. And since this chaos was due to the dissolving of being into total becoming, Lippmann saw that it was imperative to restore the notion of being; imperative to reassert the existence of God.

No one has proclaimed the inevitability of the consequence of the philosophy of total change more vividly than Lippmann. Its adherents, he writes:

brought down the humanistic ideal in the crash of the supernatural order . . . Their mere physical and chemical systems, their bundles of conditioned reflexes left no place for God and the soul, and at the same time no place for the moral law and the human ideals of justice, liberty, equality and fraternity . . . For the Hegelians, the Marxians, the pseudo-Darwinians, the Spenglerians, men were no longer inviolable essences, human persons . . . but emanations of the absolute, pawns moved around by the dialectic of history, animals struggling for survival, cells in a super-organism, incapable of having authentic

purposes, inalienable rights, or binding obligations . . . So all the landmarks of judgment were gone and there remained only an aimless and turbulent moral relativity.

Nor did Mr. Lippmann fail to see how inevitably we should lose our American way of life, if the philosophy of total change gained among us final dominance. Repeatedly in discussing our Bill of Rights, he brought out how completely the Founding Fathers understood that it could not be defended except through the recognition of an abiding universal righteousness above individuals and nations, according to which they must shape their laws.

OUR CULTURAL INHERITANCE

Many more witnesses to the growing repudiation of the philosophy of total change could be cited, especially among our national commentators who are naturally less affected by the prevailing academic doctrine than our teaching fraternity and sorority. But, as you know, even in our academic circles, the strength-gathering trend has been toward the recovery of our whole cultural inheritance.

The philosophy of total change claimed that it was emancipating us, that it set us free from the past and called on us to create an ever possibly totally new future. It really locked us up within the confines of our own experience and immediate desires. It turned us away from finding out what

were the human constants in the light of the whole experience of the race. The movement toward the reading of the great books, the witnesses to that experience, which crystallized in the St. John's program was a call to escape from our confinement.

If President Hutchins could say that he was ignorant when he was inaugurated, it was because he had not read the great books. He was no doubt in numerous and distinguished if silent company. But now we find Harvard becoming vocal in the matter. After repudiating some thirty years ago the elective system which it had so successfully sold to the country, it is now preparing to revamp its substitute, the system of concentration, in favor of provisions for a more general education. As the Harvard report on *General Education in a Free Society* expresses it: "Education must uphold at the same time tradition and experiment, the ideal and the means, subserving, like our culture itself, change within commitment."

Nor is it less significant that Yale has recently reaffirmed its conviction that religion was part of that commitment. As its recent report puts it: "A study of the effects of faith, prayer, and activities due to religious experience may be as profitable as studies in economics and agriculture." To take religious experience into consideration, the Yale report adds, is to be truly progressive and to realize

the present needs of our country and of the world.

It is indeed striking that every such return to dualistic humanism finally pointed to religion. Irving Babbitt and Walter Lippmann did, and so does the Harvard report. "We are not at all unmindful," it reads, "of the importance of religious belief in the completely good life . . . The love of God is tested by the love of neighbor; nevertheless the love of God transcends mere human obligations. We have been careful so to delimit humanism as not to exclude the religious ideal."

If we wanted to push on to the study of supernatural religion, we would have to study such books as that of Dean Lynn Harold Hough, of Drew University, who, in his *Christian Criticism of Life*, charts the way from the humanism of Irving Babbitt to Evangelical Christianity, or the recently published *Philosophy of Christian Education* of Professor H. H. Horne of New York University, or the works of Paul Elmer More and of Jacques Maritain. However, before we can discuss supernatural religion, the order of grace proclaimed by Christianity, we must first disown the atheistic philosophy of total change in favor of Theistic Humanism.

The question, then, is: Are we ready to do this? Those who believe in what may be called the American Theistic humanism movement would

answer by an emphatic "Yes." The next question would then be: How wide-spread is that movement today? The answer to that question is that it includes necessarily, not only the leaders I have cited and all their disciples, but all those who believe in a personal God, Creator of the universe; and this means the millions of traditional Protestants, Jews and Catholics.

Is there a practical way of showing in a few words how the adherence of these millions to Theistic Humanism can bear directly on our present concerns? I believe that there is. Take the recent San Francisco Charter of the United Nations. If it has left us dismayed, is it not because it showed us that the so-called united nations were not ready to subserve their own desires to a universal code of justice, to an international bill of rights, since each wished to remain free to oppose its veto power to any decision? The crux of the question is evidently that nations cannot become united unless they are ready to lay the foundation of their union in the antecedently existing moral laws which flows from the God-given nature of man. To paraphrase the words of Senator Hoar on the foundation of the United States in such a moral law, "they must exhibit the mighty spectacle of great and free peoples governing themselves by a law higher than their own desires."

Now Protestants, Jews and Catholics have actually learned to act together—one of the most consoling events in our distracted times. They could not do so on their separate understanding of supernatural religion, but they could do so on their understanding of the natural religion and ethics which follow from the recognition of God the Creator. They could do so on the basis of Theistic Humanism. They have done so in the foundation of a Peace Pattern released in 1943.

SOUND PROGRESSIVISM

Starting with the principle that "not only individuals, but states and international society are subject to the moral law which comes from God, and that all men, having the same God-given rational nature have equal dignity and consequent rights," the American Inter-Faith Peace Pattern asserts not only that we must have some sort of international organization, but that this organization must function under the universal natural law expressed in an international bill of rights.

For thus only, the Pattern brings out, may the rights of all peoples whether large or small, be safeguarded, and within each state the rights of all to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Thus only, in industrialized countries may we insure the collaboration of all groups and classes for the common good. Thus only may

we be awakened to the duty of raising the level of the submerged masses throughout the world and of helping toward political responsibility the colonial peoples, instead of exploiting them.

Here, then, is an example of the possibilities of Theistic Humanism; an escape from selfishness and contradictory imperialisms to a universal code of justice. Here is a frame-work of reference, in the American tradition, for our social science teachers, as well as a program for our statesmen.

So we may end as we began. Progressivism in education by all means, but not the progressivism of the philosophy of total change calling on us to discard all "morals conceived as a code of laws," and telling us that "truth is the majority vote of the nation that can lick all others," but the original progressivism of Francis W. Parker who still reminded us that "freedom is an individual acquirement through search for God's laws and obedience to them."

By all means let us explore and experiment. It will take plenty of exploration and experimentation to learn to fit the changing circumstances to the universal and eternal moral law, how to insure, for instance, that labor will not use its new-found freedom, to become arbitrary in turn; how to reconcile the right to private property with the social responsibility of wealth; how to diffuse

education and keep willing manual workers; how to strike the balance between national sovereignty and international control; how to liberate colonial peoples and safeguard them from anarchy.

QUALITY OF HUMANISM

But our exploration and experimentation, Theistic Humanism would say, must be taken as the search for changing adjustments in the light of abiding moral principles. In the words of Irving Babbitt, we must help our youths to fit into and perfect the ethical cosmos, and not pitchfork them into chaos.

Or take the question of motivation. It is at the heart of progressive education. But who can sanely say that motivation in the High School should be the same as in the lower grades? Does not adolescence bring the capacity to plan for the future, even at the cost of present pain? Is not character dependent upon the habit of sacrificing proximate satisfactions to higher ultimate ends? And must we not finally realize that the ultimate end of man, like his proximate ends, depends upon his nature, and his knowledge of it upon the quality of his humanism?

If so, then a sound progressivism must be based on the whole experience of the race, philosophical and religious, and not merely upon one

philosophical trend of the last century.

The motto of a sound progressive education would then be: a child-centered education, for a community-centered child, in a God-centered community.

There are, then, those who are convinced that we cannot solve our social and educational problems, or help solve the international, until we have removed the cancer of the philosophy of total change from the vitals of American education. They hold that even on its own pragmatic principle that philosophy stands condemned, since the age that saw its domination ended in two world wars, and left us at the mercy of the strongest.

Whether we accept those convictions or not, they certainly deserve the most serious consideration of us all. For there is no doubt that the philosophy of total change dissolved *being* into *becoming*, and left us, as Walter Lippmann expressed it, with "only an aimless and turbulent moral relativity." Our plight would then be that having thus dissolved moral reality, and having learned to dissolve physical reality, we are in danger of dissolving ourselves off the face of the earth. Such, I believe, is the challenge of the atomic age to American education. The answer to that challenge, it would seem, should be at least to check up most earnestly the quality of our humanism.

Family Communion

VERY REV. H. B. SCHNELTEN

*Reprinted from LAND AND HOME**

IS IT possible that the conventional method of approaching the communion rail on Sundays in society groups, one Sunday the Sodality Girls, the next, the Young Men, then the Men and then the Altar Society, might not be the best approach towards advocating a regular communion Sunday?

One of our Catholic laymen happened to be in one of our country towns in the Northwest on business for a month. As he attended Mass there, he heard the pastor announce that the following Sunday was regular communion day for the S to Z group. The following Sunday he heard that the A to H group would receive Holy Communion. This strange announcement having aroused his inquisitive nature, he ascertained from one of the parishoners that their good pastor encouraged frequent communion and even daily communion but that he emphasized communion in family groups rather than society groups once a month. Upon further inquiry he found that the parish was alphabetically so divided that approximately the same number of families received Holy Communion each Sunday in family groups.

This is indeed a new idea and when

you try to analyze the possible motives underlying it, you must agree that it does have merit in any parish and particularly in rural parishes.

In the first place, it is the whole family that is having a monthly spiritual house-cleaning, it is the entire family that is entertaining our Lord as its guest.

Secondly, loyalty to such a beautiful family custom would be aided by the example of the father, or the persuasion of the mother should she have the upper hand in such matters or even by the children through their urging. All three, together with the regular encouragement from the altar, should produce the desired effect.

Thirdly, the entire family could pile into the car together to go to confession and the following morning after Communion Mass, the family could have breakfast together. This would make unnecessary breakfast at various hours of the morning, it would save on tires and gasoline, it would be doing things a family should do, in a family way.

In connection with this method of thinking along family lines, last summer I heard a layman, a convert to the Church who is a professor at one of our renowned universities, give a

* 3801 Grand Ave., Des Moines 12, Iowa, June, 1945

lecture on *The Christian Family*. He gave this lecture, mind you, to the nuns. His object, of course, was to impress upon our teachers, the moulders of the men and women of tomorrow, the opportunity which was theirs, to inculcate into the minds and hearts of their charges the importance of *Christian Family Living*, the virtues of a truly Christian home. He not only impressed them with the ideals but also gave to them methods whereby they might be helpful in assisting to revolutionize our present method of living and help reconstruct society along *Christian Family Lines*. That his lecture was not only interesting but instructive and successful as well was evidenced by the panel discussion which followed, in which the nuns participated with surprising and keen interest.

Although he developed many constructive and fundamental ideas of Christian home-living, he was also critical of a rather universal custom in which children are separated from their parents on the occasion of First Holy Communion and regimented to the altar in a group. He expressed his own disappointment when he as father and his wife were not permitted to bring his children, as soon as they were sufficiently instructed, to the altar to receive Our Lord for the first time.

Although this is a criticism, I also

think it a very constructive suggestion which every pastor of souls will recognize as having many wholesome ramifications, e.g., in the event, if for one of many reasons, one of the parents could not be present, a proxy would be used. The parents would come to the church together with their child on the Sunday before the First Communion for a rehearsal of the ceremonies, they would be instructed how to assist their child with the prayers in preparation for the reception of Our Lord. The day itself would be one set aside for a family reunion, the fatted calf would be killed for the occasion, the first communicant would be given the place of honor between the parents at the table, would recite the prayers, etc., in a word, it would be one big day of the year in the history of that Christian Family and for that child.

It is possible that the foregoing suggestion might not be able to be made practical in some parishes and in others, where a contrary custom has prevailed, the Christian Family Method would have a prejudicial mentality against change to overcome. Nevertheless, in the light of the present day breakdown of the Christian Home, we do hope that the fostering of these ideals might result in thinking and planning along Christian Family lines, thus bringing a stronger Christ-life into the home.

Full Employment and Human Rights

RT. REV. MONSIGNOR JOHN O'GRADY

AFTER our very remarkable success in mobilizing our resources for war it is inconceivable that we should fail to mobilize them for peace. But we shall never succeed in this effort until we realize that we are living in a changed world. We can no longer be satisfied with the economic philosophy of twenty-five years ago. While we must continue to make the fullest use of the remarkable genius of the American people, we must also have a considerable amount of planning.

In the pioneer days the people of the United States were able to emerge from depression because there were vast and uncultivated resources to be explored. We still have vast unharnessed resources in our river valleys all over the country. We should be able to repeat in these river valleys what has already been done in the Tennessee Valley and along the Columbia River. I am very much interested in the proposed Missouri Valley Authority. I am interested in it not only because of the vast power resources that it will make available in many States, and because of what it will mean in flood control, but also because of what it will mean in the reclamation of land. I see vast numbers of farmers given an opportunity of owning a home on the land. I can

Testimony of the Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Charities before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the Full Employment Bill, S. 380, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, August 31, 1945.

see in this proposed Missouri Valley development a very important step in the revival of the family farm in the United States. I see it as one of the basic hopes of our democratic institutions. I see the Missouri Valley Authority not as a great engineering development, but as a great social institution. In the Missouri Valley and in other river valleys there are vast opportunities for new economic developments. We have in these proposed authorities new economic frontiers, new opportunities for investment, new wealth-producing resources, and new social resources.

HOUSING AND CITY PLANNING

Another very large field for after-the-war investment, for improving the standard of life of the people and providing new development opportunities will be found in the field of housing and city planning. In writing about the situation in Great Britain, Sir William H. Beveridge says: "Adequate and healthy housing presents the

largest single objective for desirable outlay after the war and affords the largest scope for raising the standard of life, health, and happiness." (*Full Employment in a Free Society*, p. 163.)

In a recent bulletin of the National Housing Agency, Mr. John Blandford states: "It is estimated that during the first 10 years after the war, construction of 12,600,000 nonfarm dwelling units will be needed in the United States. The great majority of these units should be provided through new construction, the remainder through conversion of existing structures." (P. 4, *Housing Needs*.) If the housing program envisaged by Mr. Blandford is carried out, it will represent an investment of seven to eight billion dollars a year.

The development of the housing program which will include units built through private enterprise and public low-cost housing, if properly handled, should have a great amount of influence in stabilizing the construction industry. It will perform a very essential service in rebuilding large sections of American cities.

I need not call the attention of the committee to something that has already been emphasized several times before Senator Taft's committee on housing, and also before the Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning of the House of Representatives, namely, the process of deterioration that is under way in American

cities. The so-called slum areas have a high degree of infant mortality, high delinquency rates, tax rates are rapidly falling off, and maintenance costs are mounting. As a result, many cities are being reduced to economic and social bankruptcy. It is inevitable that the blighted areas of American cities should be made over. This calls for a large investment of funds, both public and private. It must be a planned investment. We have learned a great deal about these areas in recent years. We have made statistical studies of administrative costs of housing, of health, of delinquency in these areas. We are pretty much in agreement as to what should be done. But we are not going to make over these blighted areas by a few housing projects here and there. It calls for large-scale planning, not only on the part of local governments but also on the part of the Federal Government. We cannot isolate private from public housing in the rebuilding of our cities. They are a part of the same program. We cannot isolate housing—public or private—from city planning, from transportation, from public utilities.

LONG-TERM PLANNING

If we could only stabilize our residential construction through long-term planning, we would have taken the most important step toward stabilizing our whole economy. At a recent hearing before the House Committee on Postwar Economic Policy

and Planning, Mr. Blandford emphasized the extremely fluctuating and unstable character of the house-building industry. During the 10-year period from 1920 to 1929, the average annual number of units started was 703,000, at an annual cost of \$3,000,000,000; while during the 10-year period 1930-39, the average annual number of units started was only 273,000, at an annual cost of slightly over a billion dollars. To sharpen the contrast all the more, he points out that there were 937,000 units, costing almost \$4,500,000,000, started in 1925 and only 93,000 units, costing only about \$285,000,000, started in 1933. It is clear, therefore, that if we can only level off the residential-construction industry on a fairly high plane in the postwar period, we shall have taken the most important step toward a full-time employment program. And, it should be remembered, that this will not call for any vast expenditure of public funds—it will be a stabilized private investment. According to Mr. Blandford's estimate we can build one and one-quarter million nonfarm residential units, and not more than 1 in 10 shall be public low-cost housing units. Housing and city planning will therefore constitute a most important element in our postwar economy and in the development of a program of full employment.

One of the most encouraging signs pointing to a program of full employment is the very intelligent plan for

highway construction under the Bureau of Public Roads of the Federal Works Agency. Under this plan \$500,000,000 a year has been authorized for the first three postwar years. These funds are to be matched by the States and local communities. The program will include work on city streets, feeder roads, primary roads, rural free delivery roads in and out of cities of 5,000 or less. With the releasing of the frozen Federal funds for highway construction, and the additional funds to be expended by the States, cities, and counties, highway construction of one kind or another during the next year will involve an expenditure of approximately \$3,000,000,000. This is most encouraging to those who are interested in public works as a method of dealing with unemployment because in the past in many respects it has been the most effective form of public work. Geographically it has reached various sections of the country to a greater degree than any other form of public work. In the providing of direct and indirect employment it has used a great variety of skills. One of the greatest difficulties about highway construction during the last depression was that States and local communities reduced their expenditures in the same degree to which the Federal Government increased its expenditures. We hear on all sides at the present time that States, counties, and cities are sitting back and waiting to see what

the Federal Government will do. They remember what happened in the early thirties. They went ahead and expended their money and later they found that the Federal Government was willing to take up the whole load.

DISTRIBUTION OF LABOR SUPPLY

The new highway program requires cities and localities to put up 50 per cent of the cost. This may look like a rigid system in dealing with some States but once the Federal Government deviates from it there appears to be no stopping point.

Everybody who has done any thinking about full employment knows that there are difficulties in the way. Sir William H. Beveridge figures that we shall always have a certain percentage—he sets it at 3 per cent—of unemployment so long as we have a free economy. This amount is needed to provide an opportunity for workers to move around in order to improve their condition. But even in reducing unemployment to this low level we shall undoubtedly have difficulties. Everybody who has observed the efforts of the country to secure an adequate distribution of its labor supply during the war knows something of the problems involved. Certainly, we shall never have any adequate method of distributing the labor supply if we turn the Employment Service back to the States. It will mean that we shall have the same condition that we have had during the war—every town will

be competing with every other town and employment offices in areas with low-wage standards will refuse to permit workers to move to other localities in which there is a demand for their labor. This is what happened during the war. When the country was confronted with certain critical situations, the Army and the Navy moved in very quickly and secured the labor they needed. Those who talk about States' rights in dealing with the labor supply are not talking in terms of realities. It must not be assumed for a moment that by any mechanism that Government sets up labor can be made completely mobile and it will therefore be in a position to respond to demands in any section of the country. After all, labor becomes rooted in certain communities. While extreme mobility may be desirable from the standpoint of industry, it involves many other problems. It involves the stability of family life; it involves housing; it involves community facilities of all kinds including churches, schools, community centers, cultural traditions, etc.

By reason of the relative immobility of labor it is necessary to give adequate thought to the location of investments and new enterprises so that employment opportunities may be provided where they are most needed. This is essential not only in private but also in public enterprise.

In order to secure a high level of production and of consumption there

must be the closest working relationships between government, labor and private industry. All the elements must work as part of a team. It should be kept in mind that the fullest utilization of our resources calls for teamwork. It calls for acceptance of a new and wider responsibility of the State but it also calls for constructive private enterprise. The State must assume the leadership but it must be a State which at all times is subject to the influence of free democratic thinking. As the State comes to assume a larger part in the life of the country, there is need for closer collaboration between the State and private effort. There is need for a thorough revitalization of all the democratic forces of the Nation. These forces must be banded together on the local community basis. The various elements in community life must learn to work together more closely. We must everywhere have a revival of the spirit of the old-time neighborhood. There must be a new emphasis on adult education. Every citizen must recognize more seriously his responsibility for participating in common affairs. There must be spread abroad everywhere a new concept of the sacredness and integrity of the individual, of the sacredness of family ties. There is a new call for a moral leadership that will guide men's minds from the cruelties of war back again to the brotherhood of man and the sacred ideals of charity and justice.

In the testimony before this com-

mittee, I am sure that there has been a very complete description of the type of budget for which the full employment bill calls. It really calls for the "social budget," for as accurate a statement as possible in regard to expenditure and investment—public and private—during the forthcoming year, and also in regard to the total labor supply. If investment and production is not sufficient to maintain the labor supply, then the deficit will have to be made up by stimulated private effort or presumably by governmental effort.

WORKERS' RIGHT TO A LIVING WAGE

The basic principle of the bill is the right of the citizen to employment. "All Americans able to work and seeking work have the right to useful, remunerative, regular and full-time employment, and it is the policy of the United States to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans who have finished their schooling and who do not have full-time housekeeping responsibilities freely to exercise this right." (Sec. 2 (b) of the bill.)

Before the 1890's there was quite a wide chasm between economics and ethics in the field of labor. Up to that time it was assumed that the wage earner received what he had added to the product. There was a recognition, of course, of some economic friction, but there was general opposition to what was regarded as the natural law

of supply and demand. Now during the nineties, under the influence of a new group of economists, there was a new emphasis on what is known as the "standard of life." People had a right to a certain standard of life. Contrasts were soon established between theory and practice. It was found that under existing conditions large numbers of people were not receiving sufficient to maintain a minimum standard of life. The leaders of American labor claimed that the securing of this standard was one of the basic purposes of the labor movement. It was the basic philosophy of labor that the worker, by positive economic action, could improve his status, could secure high wages and better working conditions. Beginning about 1910 there was a recognition of the fact that organized labor alone could not do the whole job of lifting the standard of life of the people. It had to be implemented by legislation. We therefore had a minimum-wage movement. Designedly at first it was limited to women and child wage earners. Its purpose was to secure a minimum income for all women wage earners. It was not applied to men at first because of the fear of adverse court action. This legislative program did not work out in an ideal fashion. It represented a gradual uphill struggle toward an ideal.

The same development that was applied to minimum rates of pay has also applied in the field of industrial

accidents. In this field it was necessary to apply a social remedy. The costs of industrial accidents came to be recognized as part of the responsibility of industry. This meant that the workers had a right to compensation for industrial accidents. The ideal was not reached immediately, but very important steps were taken. It was said many times in the beginning that wages could not be regulated by law; that the social principle of compensation for industrial accidents could not be embodied in law. More recently we have had a recognition, through the Social Security Act, of the fact that workers have a right to compensation against the hazards of temporary unemployment and old age. We have not yet reached this ideal for all workers but by legislative action we have taken important steps in this direction.

When various forms of social insurance were first developed, they were an extension of a pattern that had already grown up in a number of industries. The workers in those industries had recognized that they could not through their wages alone or through the sale of their products protect themselves against all the hazards of life; that they needed some sort of mutual insurance for this purpose. Therefore it is that we find that some of the early unions were basically friendly societies. There were also many other types of friendly societies. It was quite natural that the first efforts of government in this field

should be to stimulate the existing developments so that they might secure wider coverage. The basic idea, however, was that of a basic and balanced insurance program, of a program that was fully self-liquidating.

WORKER'S RIGHT TO A JOB

Side by side with this insurance program there has grown up another concept, namely, that of the responsibility of the State to provide certain basic services for individuals and families. We find the recognition of this responsibility in the field of health, in the field of education, in the field of recreation. It has also found its way into social insurance so that while we still have the thought of a system that is supported in part by industry and in part by the worker, we also have a recognition of the basic responsibility of the State to secure certain minimum standards for the citizen. We have had a great deal of experience in the application of State action to the securing of certain minimum-wage standards and the securing of a definite amount of protection for workers against the hazards that cut off their wages and their source of livelihood.

While we have had considerable success in implementing the individual's right to a living wage, to protection against the hazards that cut off his wages, we have not given very much thought to his basic right to a job. Now this right is just as fundamental as his right to a living wage

or to protection against industrial hazards, or to assistance if he is no longer able to work and does not come within a social-insurance program. We have devoted comparatively little thought to implementing this right. The growing hazard of unemployment, however, is forcing us to give more serious thought to ways and means of implementing the citizen's right to work. The alternative is mass unemployment. We know very well that during the thirties unemployment was our most serious social problem. The depression of the thirties was the severest that America had ever experienced. The time has therefore come to devise ways and means of implementing the individual's right to a job.

There is no use in implementing his other rights if we overlook this basic right. The citizen has a right to the things that are necessary for life. For the ordinary wage earner this means a full-time job. In the last analysis, he must look to Government to protect this right for him. Many people claim that this will undermine individual initiative. The same has been said about other reforms. In the minimum-wage movement one used to hear about the inefficient workers. The problem was attacked and it has been worked out. We heard the same about old-age pensions and about unemployment compensation. There are individuals who will abuse it—some malingerers—but they are few.

There is no social program that does not have some undesirable consequences but we have to think about the things that are necessary for the welfare of all the people. Government is not going to assure full-time employment without taking many important steps and it will probably make many missteps. That does not

excuse Government from trying and using every effort possible to develop new investments, to reach out for new sources of wealth and for income, so that so far as is humanly practical every citizen free of domestic and educational responsibilities will have an opportunity of engaging in remunerative and productive employment.



Catholic Unions

We constantly remind Catholics that their place is in the Catholic unions which, being truly professional and independent, are inspired by Christian morals and the social doctrine of the Church, rather than in the Socialist or Communist unions, with their materialistic conceptions of life, work and society.

The diversity of these organizations would in no way exclude the possibility of inter-syndical agreements on determined reforms, threatening no danger to the unity of the working world, but on the contrary strengthening it more efficaciously through the respect for personal liberty and the independence of the organizations.—*Statement of the French Bishops, Mar. 3, 1945.*

Catholic Education

The Catholic universities, colleges and schools constitute the greatest unified education system in the United States. It includes 210 universities and colleges, 2,371 high schools, and 8,030 elementary schools, with about 2,500,000 students. Additional thousands of students attend Catholic seminaries and normal schools.—*The CATHOLIC NEWS, New York, N. Y., Nov. 11, 1945.*

Congressmen Visit Rome

Remarks made by Pope Pius XII to a Group of Congressmen

Received in Audience at the Vatican on June 27, 1945.

YOU are most welcome, gentlemen, welcome to Rome, welcome to the Vatican City State.

Recently We have had the pleasure of receiving on different occasions several groups from both Houses of your American Congress, who were visiting war-torn Europe in search, it would seem, of first-hand knowledge of what has been happening and is happening over here. We take this as a very good sign. It shows that you and your colleagues are very much alive to the responsibilities weighing heavily today on the legislatures of the world, on the legislatures of the free peoples of the world. Men expect, and with reason, that law will be for them the bulwark of justice and truth, that in law they may find safe protection for those God-given human rights, whose free exercise is basic in any world order wherein peace may hope to take root and flourish; among others the right of every nation, small or weak as well as great or powerful, to its own life and independence; the right of every individual to worship God publicly as well as privately, and to serve Him according to the dictates of conscience.

When in any part of the world these fundamental rights are not safeguarded, or, what is worse, are infringed upon or grossly violated, however adroit or specious the pretext, that man would be very credulous who would promise himself any long respite from war; and millions of precious human lives would have been sacrificed in vain. The world of your day is too small not to be affected by the moral ideas and conduct of any one of its component nations; and the words of your first President have lost none of their meaning and force, that religion and morality are the indispensable supports of political prosperity. Without them how can you hope for obedience to law? Without them there remain only despotism, brute force, and slavery.

May God protect Europe and the world against such a calamity. That is the burden of Our prayer as We beg God to guide you in your deliberations and to bless you and your dear ones at home abundantly.

THE EDITORIAL MIND

The Right to Strike

A GREAT contribution to the cause of Labor would be a thorough revamping of its vocabulary. And one of the first terms for which a new word should be coined is the "strike."

The word "strike" has accumulated, through the years, such a retinue of distasteful connotations, that a perfectly honorable, worthy and just case is apt to start out with two strikes on it, as soon as a respectable and upright labor leader mentions the possibility of a "strike."

A community quails at the thought of a "strike," visioning brickbats, name-calling and all types of annoying and sometimes dangerous disturbances, not to mention long weeks of idleness for breadwinners and shortage or lack of bread for the families involved.

Such is an untrue picture of the modern strike, also an unfair public reaction and a false appraisal of the principle at stake and of the methods endorsed by competent union leadership. The "horrible examples" paraded by a hostile press (and most of the secular press is hostile to the Labor cause), are either exceptional,

exaggerated in the facts publicized, of Red instigation or lacking the approval of conscientious union leaders.

By all the canons of justice, Labor has a right to strike, when working conditions become unreasonable, wages inadequate and employers arbitrary in their unwillingness to adjust rightful claims through the normal channels of discussion and arbitration. And the public is wrong, if not morally culpable in ignoring the claims of Christian charity, to frown upon or to thwart Labor's most effective means of securing justice.

In the cause of social justice, Labor has a justifiable claim on the public's forbearance to suffer a fair share of inconvenience. In any strike the public's sympathy is invaluable. In a just strike, it is inescapable to the conscientious. It would be next to inhuman for the rank and file of the people to obstruct or ignore the welfare of the persons who need their help most, and most often deserve it.

"The 'right to strike' has acquired the status of a sacred 'freedom' and has been widely accepted," said Westbrook Pegler, the country's most persistent kibitzer of Organized Labor. Although meant in derision, Pegler never said a truer word.

Labor's right to refuse to work, when conditions become unbearable and no other adjustment of rightful claims is available, is a sacred freedom, connected intimately with Labor's inalienable right to organize for collective bargaining.

It should be respected by all right-thinking people and safeguarded against the rampant propaganda of those who have no thought but to use the workingman as so much chattel.—THE EVANGELIST, *Albany*, N. Y., Nov. 9, 1945.

Good and Bad Comics

IN A RECENT SURVEY, sixteen of twenty-seven comics were found to be "definitely vicious"; five others were listed as "undesirable"; one was termed as "of no significant interest" and one described as "a desirable suggestion pattern."

The comics were taken from one of the large Sunday newspapers appearing in this city and other large cities of the United States. The judge was John L. McIntire of George School, a Pennsylvania institution which is under the auspices of non-Catholics. He was assisted by fifty adolescent boys and a few older persons. Their appraisal of the twenty-seven comics was as follows:

"About 40 per cent teach that success is possible only by taking the law into one's own hands; 27 per cent teach disrespect for marriage rela-

tions; 23 per cent insist that 'smart' children can always outwit adults, and only one strip in the whole lot suggests that success is related to high morals and ethical standards."

How popular are the comics was shown by the big drop in circulation of the three Detroit dailies when on one Sunday the comics did not appear. One paper lost about 85,000 in circulation on that Sunday.

There is little question that many of the so-called "funnies" have a pernicious effect and promote juvenile delinquency.

Parents who are concerned for the welfare of their children can do two things to minimize the harm caused by comics. As the Pennsylvania critic suggests, they can censor the crime type of comics and point out to their boys and girls why these "funnies" are objectionable. They can encourage the reading of wholesome comics. Among these are *True Comics*, *Timeless Topix* and *Heroes All*. —THE MICHIGAN CATHOLIC, *Detroit, Mich.*, Nov. 11, 1945.

Who Rules Poland?

IF THERE has been any doubt in any quarter on the domination of the Polish Provisional Government by Soviet Russia, it should be dispelled by the announcement by the Warsaw Radio that the new regime set up as a result of the Yalta agreement has denounced the Concordat

which has been in effect between Poland and the Holy See since 1925.

Poland is one of the most Catholic countries in the world. Its loyalty to the Holy See is as traditional as that of Catholic Ireland. For Poland to repudiate a solemn agreement with the Vatican is as unthinkable as for Eire to act in that manner. The Polish Provisional Government is no more representative of Poland than the Nazi puppet regimes reflected the will of the peoples of the countries which were under their heel.

The excuse for the denunciation of the Concordat is the appointment of Apostolic Administrators in Nazi-dominated areas without consultation with the Polish Government. The Government-in-Exile in London was the Polish authority at the time, recognized by all the United Nations. It raised no question.

But the Nazi regime did object, demanding the right to pass on the appointment of Bishops not only in Germany but in Nazi-occupied territory. Cardinal Maglione, then Papal Secretary of State, rebuffed Hitler by asserting that it was not the practice of the Holy See to permit objections of a political nature to be made to the appointment of Apostolic Administrators and by declining to appoint Bishops in the areas the Nazis had seized.

This is but another instance of the bad faith of Soviet Russia, and of the pathetic plight of valiant Poland, the invasion of which by the Nazis

was the occasion of England's entering the war. The difference between Nazi and Soviet domination of Poland is not apparent to any person sincere in his advocacy of the Atlantic Charter, which was to be the basis for peace in the postwar world.—*The CATHOLIC NEWS, New York, N. Y., Sept. 22, 1945.*

Continental Masonry

RETURNING FROM an extensive visit through Europe, Justice George E. Bushnell of the Michigan Supreme Court told a Boston audience: "Many Masons were executed in Spain. A Spaniard who was to be shot with a group of 20 or 30 Free Masons told me how one group was forced to march 17 miles into the country. They were forced to dig their own graves and then were shot to death before they fell into the open graves. The Spaniard escaped because he was an American citizen."

The Justice, a lieutenant grand commander of the 33rd and last degree of the Ancient Accepted Scottish Rite, admitted: "I did not visit Spain." But he has it, he says, "on good authority" that this atrocity did occur in the manner described.

People of decent instincts can feel nothing but disgust and abhorrence for brutality, no matter who the culprit may be. But there was a pertinent point which Justice Bushnell

lacked the time to discuss. It's this—between Masonry in Europe and Masonry in the United States there's the difference of night and day. On the Continent the brotherhood is very active politically. Not from any dislike of Masonry as such, but because of the order's incurable itch to play politics, one European country after another has waged war on the lodges. Sometimes the ban was absolute—as in Turkey. Other times the disapproval was mitigated—as in Finland where in 1934 army and naval officers were forbidden membership in the Masonic order.

Let's recall a fragment of history—it could be applicable to this discussion.

On March 10, 1848, members of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite appeared before the Provisional Government of France. Lamartine congratulated and thanked them—"I am convinced that it is from the depths of your lodges that have emanated, first in the shade, then in the half-light, and finally in the full light of day, the sentiments which ended by producing the sublime explosion we witnessed in 1789 . . ."

Now it is a fact that in Spain, in 1936, at the outbreak of civil war, the Grand Orient Lodge of Spain openly and formally affirmed its sup-

port of the so-called Loyalists. Whether this declaration represented only a pious hope, or whether it meant that Spanish lodges intended to plot and conspire as they plotted and conspired in the French Revolution, is not clear to us at this distance. If they did aspire, working "first in the shade, then in the half-light" to produce a "sublime explosion," the fuse failed to reach the bomb. But one could hardly blame Franco for resenting the attempt.

Please, let's not misunderstand one another. This is not a "defence of Franco." Least of all is it an effort to palliate cruelty. If the Spanish ruler condemned 30 Free Masons to death merely because they were Free Masons, then he ranks with other contemporaneous mass murderers—Hitler, Tojo and Stalin.

The whole purpose here is to point out that between Masonry in the United States—the philanthropic, genial, non-political Masonry which on occasion magnanimously lends its temples to Catholic congregations—and Masonry on the Continent, there exists an essential difference. Planners of a "sublime explosion" which fails to come off, must expect at times to be hoist on their own petard.—*THE PILOT, Boston, Mass., Sept. 29, 1945.*

Has Fascism Ended with Mussolini?

DON LUIGI STURZO

Reprinted from the REVIEW OF POLITICS*

THIS QUESTION may be answered by "yes" or "no," according to one's point of view. Mussolini's Fascism—that of the black shirts, of banners bearing the skull and bones emblem, of the so-called Roman salute, of parades, punitive expeditions with muskets, clubs and castor oil, of the East African Empire and the Albanian Kingdom—may be called dead, even buried. But the Fascism that ante-dates Mussolini, the Fascism of all times and all countries—that brand of Fascism never dies. It adapts itself, instead, to all climates and all temperatures; it dresses according to the fashion, disguises itself and hides. That brand of Fascism has not died because it is deathless.

The destiny of names, like that of men, is strange. Fascism was as insignificant name: it was taken from the Lictorian fasces of ancient Rome to indicate power or strength in union. Mussolini and a group of First World War veterans chose it to differentiate themselves from (or even to oppose, out of jealousy) the *Arditismo*, the name taken by the followers of D'Annunzio who had excited popular fancy with the expedition of Fiume (1920). *Arditismo* was

derived from *arditi* (the bold; the daring; the audacious), a name given in the Italian Army to those squadrons and groups appointed for daring attacks and difficult undertakings. (In other countries similar groups were called death or suicide squadrons, and by other colorful or degrading names.) Mussolini invented the name of *Fascio* (*bundle*); from that were later derived *Fascista* and, finally, *Fascismo*. It is so easy to invent a new name; the difficulty lay in giving the name a meaning. This difficulty was greater because the author really meant so little himself.

Mussolini came from the left wing of Socialism; he had, as an ideal, the social revolution, or rather the Revolution (with a capital R) as means and as an end. It was no wonder that Mussolini, even when he was a dictator, could not help affirming the revolution that had been made and the revolution that was to come. In all his youth he had heard nothing but talk of revolution and its exaltation as a world palingenesis.

It worried him that Italian Socialism was dominated by the reforming wing with Turati and Bissolati at the head, that within it there prevailed the founders and administra-

* University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., July, 1945.

tors of cooperatives, popular banks and labor unions, that these leaders thought of everything except revolution.

During the Libyan War he tried to arouse the people against the Government; he succeeded only in some sporadic demonstrations, tearing up railroad tracks and massing crowds of women and children in front of trains transporting troops. The attempt failed.

THE FIRST FASCIO

Another revolt was tried later in Ancona in 1913; it was called "The Red Week;" it, too, failed. (The Socialist leaders of that time did not want to participate in the Government in order not to collaborate with the capitalistic bourgeoisie and did not promote revolution, except in words, because the occasion was not deemed mature.) Mussolini could not thus await its hour, and, seizing the opportunity offered by the World War in which Italian public opinion was favorable to intervention on the Allies' side, he suddenly left the Socialists and their newspaper, *L'Avanti* (of which he was chief-editor), and founded a new newspaper at Milan with the subsidy of the French Government. During the war, his name became popular because he knew how to write with ease polemics against his former companions for their neutrality, while he boosted, in his turn, that exaggerated and inconsistent na-

tionalism which was then in vogue.

When the war ended, the working masses and a good part of the middle classes and veterans flocked to the Social-Communist Party (Socialists and Communists were at that time fused) and to the Christian Democratic Party (then called the Popular Party). Mussolini found himself with a handful of companions, but without followers. The dreamed-for revolution was escaping from his hands. He thought of an extreme program that should be republican, anti-clerical, anti-capitalist and nationalist; this was the 1919 program of the first *Fascio* created at Milan. The workers did not follow him; those to the Left did not believe in his program. In the meantime, for the anti-Socialist struggle, Mussolini got money from the industrialists and landed proprietors of the Valley of the Po, help from the heads of the Army, and favor from the bankers and some politicians.

What decided Mussolini to leave the Left and pass to the Right, always, of course, as a revolutionary, was the fact (a revelation for him) that in the general political elections of November 1919, he was not able to obtain—with the system of proportional representations so favorable for small parties—a single seat in Parliament, either for himself or for others of his Party, whereas the Socialists (together with the Communists) obtained 158 seats and the

Popularists (Christian Democrats) 99 seats.

The Fascist revolution had no appeal at that time. Mussolini would find an audience wherever he would exaggerate the Bolshevik peril, whenever he would send his armed squads to burn cooperatives and assail Municipal Palaces of the Communes administered by Socialists. And, since the hatred that the industrialists and agrarians bore against trade unions was also directed against the Christian Democrats, the "punitive" expeditions made by the Fascists were extended to the men and institutions of the Popular Party.

In this undertaking Mussolini found those aids from the Capitalist and "Liberal" sides that he never could have dreamed of obtaining had he continued to be a revolutionary of the Left. He shifted his Republicanism to an understanding with the Monarchy, his anti-clericalism to amity with the clergy, his social revolution to the support of the capitalists. His success was assured.

This is not the occasion to re-tell its history: there are thousands of books, *pro* and *con*, and many others will be written on the subject. I mention it only to arrive at the principal fact that I intend to emphasize: the lack in him of convictions and stable principles. Thus the revolutionary menace served him only as a means for achieving power, it mattered not a jot whether with the help of the

working masses or against the same masses. Once power was obtained, the revolutionary menace served to support him against the working masses or against the bourgeois classes; against the Church or against Freemasonry, as needed. And thus did Mussolini work during all his life, in the national field as well as in the international, by creating around himself boundless expectations and limitless distrusting, until, finally, his game could no longer serve him. When he bound himself to the fate of Hitler, he suddenly lost his personal character, his political consistency, even his physical figure; he returned to his real being: the mask that falls, the stage performer that returns behind the scenes, the shadow that disappears.

The difference between Mussolini on one side and Franco, Pétain, Dollfuss and Salazar on the other, lies precisely in this, that Mussolini never believed in Fascism as an ideal and as a principle. He made use of it only as a technique for power, while the others, though they adapted to the particular situation of their countries the Fascist technique, believed or still believe in non-Fascist ideals (I should say ideals of authoritarianism and conservatism) which have been or are the basis of their action. Notwithstanding this, they, too, are to be blamed, in measure with their actions, for having introduced, either in the acquisition or in the exercise

of power, Fascist methods which exceed by a long stretch the authoritarian and arbitrary methods of princes of the 17th and 18th centuries.

Franco and the others represent an intermediate phase between the anti-liberal authoritarianism of the Holy Alliance and the Fascism of Mussolini. The element that characterizes them is that political or clerical Catholicism of the beginning of the past century which opposed every constitutional system, every form of political liberty. Liberty was then badly understood by clericals but it could have been re-linked to the Christian tradition of popular sovereignty and to the democratic regime. These Catholics were the late heirs of such a clericalism; they saw in Fascism a system of "popular" reaction and a means (however violent) of political recovery which made possible that Corporative State by which, according to them, the authority of the State would be reconciled with the well-being of the working classes. They accepted Fascism as a method capable of overcoming the demagoguery of the Socialists and the subversiveness of the Communists. Moreover, in their anti-historical religious conception, they saw again in action the collaboration of the State with the Catholic Church, through concordats, or even without, but with the mutual aid of favors and services.

How far all of this was from true

Fascism (from which Nazism took a great deal) as well as from the democratic concept of Western Civilization, has been seen during the war and will be seen better still after the war by those countries which will have a chance of not falling into the Moscow sphere of influence. The others will pass from one totalitarianism to another and God alone knows when they will be able to breathe the air of liberty or, at least, have assured the elementary right of human personality.

TOTALITARINISM

Mussolini (who had "genialoid" intuitions) invented the adjective "totalitarian" and applied it to his system with the celebrated affirmation: "Nothing out of the State, above the State, against the State; everything from the State, for the State, and in the State." From that sprang the substantive: *totalitarismo* (the English and American say *totalitarianism*) and from that time (about twenty years ago) the two words entered into all languages without the permission of linguists even, or of the compilers of dictionaries.

Totalitarianism is the common qualification that can be applied to Mussolini's Fascism, Hitler's Nazism, Stalin's Communism, Franco's Falangism and so forth. It is understood that between the concentration camps of Dachau or Buchenwald and those of the deportees to Siberia from

one side and the "Confino" in the Islands of Ponza, Ustica, Lipari and Pantelleria there was some difference; that between Hitler's or Stalin's purges and Mussolini's Statal Defense Court there was also some difference; that between the suppression of the Jews in Germany and the laws against the Jews in France and Italy there was some difference. The Latin temperament and the relative traditions enter into the account, but when the human beast is in the clutches of fear or hatred, at bottom it is always the same. This has been seen during this war in those zones of Italy under the Nazi and Fascist yoke.

If real Fascism, the Mussolinian brand, has fallen, totalitarianism survives its unhappy "literary" author, because at bottom it lived before him. Napoleon Bonaparte gave a first sample of it to the modern world; the ancients were called tyrants, but the peoples of that time and the Church knew how to resist tyrants or avoid their clutches; today, both peoples and Church have been and are still less equipped to resist totalitarianisms. There is still another difference between totalitarianism and ancient tyranny; the latter was personal or of the family or caste, and did not claim to appeal to the people for its consent or to solicit their national sentiments or their social aspirations; it is modern totalitarianism that calls the people into its orbit,

regiments them for its own ends and constrains them to servitude through a single party. Today only two such parties survive: the Communist and the Falangist. The latter is about to fall because Franco at last doubts the system, the Spanish Church from having been tepid and tolerant now has become opposed to Falangism, and the opinion of neighboring countries is clearly opposed.

Instead, Communist totalitarianism is spreading and is becoming a terrible heir of the Fascisms of Pilsudski, Horthy, Schuschnigg, Antonescu, and of the various Serbian, Bulgarian, and perhaps Greek, Kings and Regents. We shall not speak of what Germany, occupied by the Russians, will be; there, a new totalitarianism will be "justified" by military and even (why not?) "educational" reasons for extracting the poison of Nazi totalitarianism from the Germans. Let us hope it will not be so: hope never dies.

On the other hand, let us see what may be the Fascist residues in the Western countries which are presumed to be, now or in the future, democracies. We begin, of course, with Italy.

It cannot be denied that there exists in that country signs of Fascist survival. I do not speak of the Monarchy, which, although infected with Fascism for so many long years, as an institution cannot be called Fascist. But the men of the House of

Savoy, the entourage of high officials, of court people, of defenders and supporters of the Monarchy (outside of the Liberal *élite* around Croce) has a more or less Fascist mentality. This is not said with the purpose of crying: "Wolf, Wolf;" some Fascists there are in all the Parties: those who were Fascists to earn their livelihood, others because of a nationalistic spirit, and, also, alack and alas, some who really believed in Fascism. Ninety per cent of them were deceived or attracted by the enviroing atmosphere (as many were in foreign countries outside Italy), but they had no crimes for which they had to answer before their judges. It is their mentality, their spirit, their education that must be changed. It will be changed assuredly. Indeed, it is in the process of changing and events teach more than words.

DANGER OF POST-FASCISM

This post-Fascism may have some influence but in itself it causes no fear. There is another Fascism to be feared. If Italy is further humiliated politically and submitted to territorial mutilations and the loss of colonies, willy-nilly, a nationalism of resentment will develop widely, Fascist ideas and secret Fascist propaganda (which will not be lacking) will kindle a fire that it will be very difficult to extinguish, even though during certain periods it will remain under ashes.

Another post-Fascism is that of street violence against opposing parties, practiced today by certain Communist groups against Christian Democrats, by certain local groups in southern Italy against Socialists and Communists, and by the Separatists in Sicily against their adversaries. Demagogues are not lacking to threaten in the newspapers of the Left even a civil war if what they propose is not allowed.

It can be said that this spirit of violence is a product of the war and that it is not lacking in any European country, France and Belgium included; but for a country such as Italy which, besides the wars (and what wars!), has had more than twenty years of Fascism in power and, before that, three more years of street Fascism, the spirit of violence assumes a character that I should call endemic and which gives food for thought.

Misery, hunger, inflation, the black market, the secret terms of the Armistice, workers' unemployment, the fall of money, have influenced and are influencing banefully the creation of a general state of mind which (would that I were mistaken) I should call either pre-Fascist or pre-totalitarian, even if, as I believe, it will not go as far as the Communist experiment — unless London and Washington (through their lack of comprehension and their mistakes) push Italy toward that line:

What we say of Italy may be said,

with variants adapted to each case, of all the Latin countries, even of the neutral countries of the Iberian peninsula which likewise have an indigenous Fascism and which, notwithstanding their neutrality, do not fail to feel the economical, psychological and political effects of the war.

What is surprising is to find wide traces of Fascism in England as well as in America. Let not the reader marvel. When Winston Churchill, on December 15, could announce to the House of Commons with a sense of tranquillity that about ten million persons will be *disentangled* from local populations and *transferred*, also expelled, within or outside of Poland, and that this will be done *humanly* with modern means at our disposal, one remains incredulous, uncertain whether such an affirmation is being made in a country of liberal tradition, or whether its authors are Mussolini or Kemal Pasha. Mussolini succeeded in transferring only about 150,000 Tyroleans and Kemal Pasha only about one million Greeks of Anatolia.

But the greatest astonishment has been caused not only by the lack of spiritual reaction on the part of the English people against a violation of this kind of the rights of human personality, but by the consent of many political men, statesmen, scientists, journalists, clerics and laity. We have heard that Benes and his Government have proposed to purify Czechoslovakia of Sudeten Germans

(to be shipped to Germany), that Horthy told the Allies that Germans or other minorities of Hungary should be pushed out beyond the boundaries. This "readjustment of populations" against the individual will of each person, against his personal rights, his interests and family ties, under the pretext of a homogeneous race, national interests, state security, is the summit of injustice and is in line with Fascist criteria of the rights of the State over individuals.

It is true that similar transfers of populations were not lacking in the eras of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation; but in those times the populations were given the option of staying and submitting to civil and religious limitations or of emigrating where they would find a benevolent prince or a free zone as in America. But, for us, those wars, those deportations were barbarities against which succeeding centuries reacted. That from the House of Commons was to come a similar proposal which did not find a chorus of disapprovals is something that gives one thoughtful concern. That Fascist totalitarianism should have reached the point of defiling Gladstone's country. It is the peak!

But there is worse still: the proposal to make slaves of German laborers for the reconstruction of the occupied countries. It is one thing to exact an indemnity from the German people, obliging the new German

state to distribute the burdens as best it may; it is another thing to oblige definite individuals, who have the fortune or misfortune of being masons, carpenters, smiths, engineers and such to undergo years of servitude in a foreign country. No matter how much it may be organized, such a "service" is always a form of war slavery, discarded (we thought) forever. That this should be demanded by Moscow causes no surprise, considering the dictatorial mentality and their Czarist, Leninist traditions; but by some people in Paris, in London, in Brussels. . . . !

CONTEMPT FOR HUMAN PERSONALITY

If anyone reads the proposals of certain American scientists, usually of positivistic mentality, and the proposals, sometimes, too, of the man in the street, he finds suggestions that cause amazement. There are some who propose the sterilization of all the Japanese; others, convinced of the impossibility of "educating" the Germans, propose their destruction. If I myself had not read with my own eyes these proposals, some mad, others criminal, I should not believe it possible that they should have been made. But the worst is that they find reception in the press and that unconscious journalists and editors, anxious about circulation, do not think of throwing them into the waste paper basket, instead of giving diffusion of such ideas. These ideas pene-

trate into the depths of consciousness, they find a hearing in some spheres of public opinion, they accustom the common mentality to find these things natural, or rather, inherent in the spirit of the time. And there are no voices of protest except those usual few and weak ones that end by not counting.

The fundamental error of Fascism was the contempt for human personality. This contempt is at the basis of every anti-Christian concept of man and it became characteristic of the Fascism that wanted to deify the State and identify itself with it in Mussolini's celebrated epiphonema recorded above, "Nothing outside, above or against the State; everything from the State, for the State, in the State." It is worth recalling that Pius XI raised his voice against such a theory many times, from the Christmas allocution of 1926 up to the very end of his life.

Fascism derived this attitude from the positivists of the nineteenth century. They, however, counterbalanced their concept of the State with that vague humanitarianism which, at least, caused them to take into account the interests and rights of man (I say "rights," though no true positivist can admit that rights exist, since rights have a spiritual content).

But when the humanitarianism of the past century declined as being inconsistent with positivism, human personality had no other defense ex-

cept that of the play of forces in conflict: the class struggle of Karl Marx served Socialism and frightened the bourgeoisie; the bourgeoisie caused liberty, for which it had fought for two centuries, to collapse. There was, moreover, no other solution in the politico-economic field, except "Statal Monism," either in the name of the nation (Fascism), of the race (Nazism) or, on the other side, in the name of the class (Communism). Such iron unification crumbled for Fascism and Nazism only on the field of battle; it has not crumbled for Communism which, because of the effects of the present war, is thriving among the European masses.

COMMUNISM'S OTHER FACE

But Communism itself, from the economic and political viewpoint, is but the other face of Capitalism, to which it seems to be antagonistic. Modern society is based on a capitalistic system and cannot do without it. Whether capital is in the hands of a few capitalists or in the hands of the bureaucracy of the Communist State is insignificant incidence if both are responsible for the appalling phenomena of our times: the totalitarian war and the new slavery of industrialized labor. But it would be worse indeed if Capitalism and Communism make an alliance in the international field in order to create a joint power for common aims even though over distinct spheres of in-

fluence. Their totalitarianism would then cover all human activities.

In such as event our modern society would endure the last consequences of that political and social "Monism" which for the past century has infected philosophy, science, politics, economics and public opinion, weakening one by one all the institutions that our Judeo-Christian civilizations built up in defense of human personality.

The Anglo-American and the Scandinavian democracies themselves, which more than the other European democracies have maintained Christian ideas and feelings through the Reformation and Counter-Reformation periods and the following revivals, are no longer capable of finding those moral convictions which, if truly felt, can draw out of the minds and hearts of peoples the venom of positivism. They also, of course, are going to encounter some experiences of totalitarianism.

It makes no difference if we call it Fascism or Communism: though each be placed at the opposite ends of the arch of a pendulum, they have the same impulses, the same fundamental concepts, namely: the spirit of violence and the use of force as a means to acquire and maintain power, the subordination of the legal rights and moral values of the human personality to the interests of the State, the loss, be it gradual or violent, of Liberty!

Truth and Tolerance

MOST REV. FRANCIS J. SPELLMAN, D.D.

Excerpts from a Commencement address delivered at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, July 1, 1945.

OUR ideal is peace. But the attaining and maintaining of this ideal must be rooted in realism. Realism and idealism are not mutually antagonistic and they should work together to the defense of our rights and the consideration and protection of the rights of others. Realism without idealism is pragmatic and intolerant, and in our own strength we should be tolerant. . . .

On this occasion when this University honors me, and for which I express my gratitude, I wish to speak on the competence, the responsibility and the destiny of our universities to rescue the world from unwanted wanton war. Universities and university men should be the leaders in striving to save the world from war by saving one of war's first and most pitiable victims—truth. We are witnesses to the enslavement of whole peoples by tyrants who know that the most effective subjugation of men is through the enslavement of the intellect.

The date May 10, 1933, will be recorded in history as a day of great sin against learning, truth and tolerance, for on that date Nazi students paraded through the university towns of Germany and burned thousands of volumes in the central squares of those towns in what was called "ideological rearmament."

PLEADS FOR TRUTH

Teachers were no longer free to teach truth, but were forced to indoctrinate their students with the official Nazi viewpoint. Universities became instruments to implement the progress of Nazi tyranny and the Minister of Education warned scholars to free themselves from the false idea of objectivity. In Italy boys and girls became puppets of the state; and the Japanese Government established a "Bureau of Thought Supervision." Thus we of our generation have been the witnesses of what can and does happen to the freedom of a people when governments or individuals assume dictatorship in education.

There is a strong relationship between attacks on objective truth and intolerance, for intolerance is the offspring of ignorance and falsehood.

Prayerfully I plead that a university be a seat of truth and a center of tolerance and thus be a bulwark for peace. Lies and intolerance are the causes of war, and truth and tolerance are its victims.

If a university is to fulfill its mission, it should be conceived in truth, be a citadel of tolerance and a watchtower of wisdom. This is the university's mighty contribution to freedom. This is the "credo" of true Americans—the "credo" of religious, industrial, educational and social freedom.

Americans, true Americans, deplore racism, intolerance, lies and injustice. Americans, true Americans, are the beneficiaries of the enterprise and sacrifices of forebears in gaining our God-given rights, which we, their heirs, must never, never surrender.

We must be watchful lest any form of bigotry, political, racial or religious, destroy our national life and independence, and paganize America. . . .

STRUGGLE FOR GOD-GIVEN RIGHTS

There are intellectual bigots who would deny the existence of God, God's laws and man's God-given rights, yet the very dignity of man depends upon personal spiritual independence.

America and Americans need only to look at the record and the wreckage of those intellectually bigoted Governments and peoples who became gods and laws unto themselves, in order to be convinced of the nobility of our democratic government and life.

It is our sacred trust to be lovers of truth and tolerance, to be the Pledge and the Proof that men can live in mutual respect.

It is our sacred trust in our high destiny under God, to stand before the peoples of the world as an example of unselfish devotion to the ideals that have made us a great nation, the Christian ideals of liberty, truth, tolerance and unity builded of respect for God's image in man and in every man's right to life, liberty and happiness.



Economic Security

Obviously the need for economic security is universal and has no inevitable relationship with race problems. It has however become tied to them, because insecure men will use racism as a means of keeping their jobs . . . Any solution of the race problem is tied to our basic problem of attaining economic security.—*From SOCIAL ACTION, Feb. 15, 1945.*

Man's Relation to the Land

GOD created the world, of which the earth is a portion, with a purpose, and through His loving Providence He maintains the world for the good of human beings. Therefore, all human beings possess a direct natural right to have access to created natural resources.

God's intention in creation is to enable man to live with dignity in accord with his noble nature and destiny, to develop his personality, to establish and maintain a family and to be a useful member of society. Society exists to fulfill these aims.

The land is God's greatest material gift to mankind. It is a fundamental source of food, fiber and fuel. The right to use such elemental source of life and development is essential for human welfare. No law or contract is superior to natural law. A fundamental human right is not to be denied or rendered ineffective by any legal ordinances, apparent previous rights or obligations.

Land is a very special kind of property. Ownership of land does not give an absolute right to use or abuse, nor is it devoid of social responsibilities. It is in fact a stewardship. It implies such land tenure and use as to enable the possessor to develop his personality, maintain a decent standard of living for his family and fulfill so-

This "Statement of Principles which shall underlie our National, State and Individual Actions" was issued in August by Catholic, Protestant and Jewish agriculture leaders.

cial obligations. At the same time, the land steward has a duty to enrich the soil he tills and to hand it down to future generations as a thank offering to God, the Giver, and as a loving inheritance to his children's children.

THE FAMILY AND LAND

Since the family is the primary institution, access to land and stewardship of land must be planned with the family unit in view. The special adaptability of the farm home for nurturing strong and wholesome family life is the reason for the universal interest in land use and rural welfare. A unique relationship exists between the family and the vocation of agriculture. The farm is the native habitat of the family. The family's welfare must therefore have the first consideration in economic and social planning. Throughout the history of the United States these fundamental principles have been worked out through national and State legislation, and they have been upheld by court decisions and popular acclaim.

Efficiency in land use is not to be judged merely by material production but by a balanced consideration of the spiritual, social and material values that redound therefrom to person, family and society. The land is not to be a source of benefit to a favored few and a means of servile labor to the many.

Second only to making land available to the family is the responsibility of society to encourage and to educate the land stewards in the proper and most efficient use of the land and in such techniques as will make them masters of their own economic destiny.

The worker on the land and his family possess the first right to the fruits of their toil for a decent standard of living. Second to such right come the rights of any non-operating owner and of the state. Rural people have the right to receive directly their just share of the economic, social and religious benefits in organized society.

The stewards of the land owe sacred duties and obligations to God, the community and humanity. A faithful and honest fulfillment of their responsibilities goes hand in hand with their rights and privileges.

SUGGESTED METHODS FOR THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE DECLARED PRINCIPLES ON LAND POLICY:

1. Make use of the land an integral part of socio-economic planning and thinking.

2. Insist that education for land stewardship and the productive home

be outstanding features of rural education.

3. Emphasize a special program of enlistment and training in secondary, liberal arts, technical and professional schools for professional service to the rural community.

4. Make the family-type farm operated by the owner a major objective of legislation and planning.

5. Reform the system of taxing land and improvements so as to facilitate access to natural resources, security of tenure and proper land use.

6. Revise land sale and rental contracts, mortgage obligations and other debt instruments so that no loss of ownership or insecurity of tenure be possible except through negligence or injustice on the part of the farmer-operator.

7. Discourage large land holdings as undemocratic and unsocial.

8. Where large-scale production is necessary and advisable, encourage the use of cooperative techniques with local ownership and management.

9. At all times encourage cooperatives as a means of intellectual, moral and material advancement.

10. Where and when large-scale industrialized farming exists and requires employment of seasonal or year-round labor, demand for such labor group a living family wage, decent housing conditions and collective bargaining.

11. Urge that wages and housing for the laborer on the small farms be

decent and just. (Low wages and poor housing for the farm laborer tend to lower the reward and standards of living of the family-type farmer.)

12. Extend social security provisions, particularly health, old age and survivors' insurance, to farm people and other rural dwellers.

13. Develop locally owned and controlled business and industry in rural communities.

14. Encourage development of the "one foot on soil and one foot in the city" type of living as greatly advantageous to the family when adequate cash income is secured from work in industry or commerce.

15. Make land settlement possible for returned soldiers and displaced war workers through proper financial and educational planning, provided qualified people so desire and sound arrangements can be made.



Organic Society

There is a principle of philosophy which calls upon the fundamental and primary groups of our society to assume, and to insist upon the right to assume, every function which they can properly carry out themselves. Thus, the family should not surrender to the State the function of raising and educating its children. Vocational groups, such as labor unions, should not surrender to the Government those aims which they can achieve alone. And the town or city should not surrender to the State, nor the State to the Federal Government, those functions which it can perform itself. Of course, there are functions which can be adequately and efficiently performed only by the Federal Government or other secondary groups. But democracy and the dignity of man demand that each of us carry his own burdens well and faithfully if we wish to be independent and free.—*Hon. Lewis B. Schwollenbach, Secretary of Labor, from Radio Address, Sept. 3, 1945.*

Cooperatives and the Problem of Poverty

MARTIN E. SCHIRBER, O.S.B.

*Reprinted from THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW**

POVERTY has long been a fertile seed-bed of cooperation. The riotous cooperative movement previous to 1844 gathered its driving force from poverty; and Rochdale cooperation was conceived and got its start in life amid the hard times of the hungry forties. So poor were the pioneers that the original capital for the Rochdale Society had to be collected a two-pence at a time until it reached the staggering sum of £28. After the store had been in operation for a few months, it was decided to add tea and tobacco to the original inventory of flour, butter, sugar, oatmeal and candles. Holyoake's account of the meeting held for this purpose is more eloquent of the poverty of Rochdale than a statistical report: "... for the second time in the history of the Rochdale store, do we hear of any member being in possession of more than two-pence. One member 'promised to find' half-a-crown. . . . Another member 'promised to find' five shillings, and another 'promised to find' a pound."¹

The depth of poverty out of which the Rochdale movement rose is de-

scribed by the same writer as follows:

The Rochdale pioneers began their work when distress was widespread. The handloom weaver seemed to be the worst off of any of the working class. Improved machinery had driven him to the lowest point at which he could live. The condition of things in Rochdale would be incredible did it not rest upon authority. Sharman Crawford, the member for the borough, declared in the House of Commons in the debate September 20, 1841, that in Rochdale there were 136 persons living on 6d. per week, 200 on 10d. per week, 508 on 1s. per week, 855 on 1s. 6d. per week, and 1500 were living on 1s. 10d. a week. Five-sixths of those he spoke of had scarcely any blankets, eighty-five families had no blankets, forty-six families had only chaff beds, with no covering at all.²

It is not to be wondered at, then, that the "objects and plans" of the Rochdale Society should be "to form arrangements for the pecuniary benefit and the improvement of the social and domestic condition of its members. . . ."³

But the question that confronts us now is what cooperation *has* done to relieve poverty, and what it *can* do if given a chance. Pope Leo XIII seemed

¹ Holyoake, George Jacob, *The History of the Rochdale Pioneers*, London: Allen & Unwin, Nov., 1893, p. 16.

² *Ibid.*, p. 67-68.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

* Loyola University, Chicago 26, Ill., March, 1945

to think that a remedy was still to be found: "We all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness which press so heavily at this moment on the large majority of the very poor."⁴ And while admitting that "the horrible 'pauperism' of the days of Leo XIII is less prevalent today," Pope Pius XI nevertheless reechoes Leo's plea for uplifting the proletariat.⁵ Cooperatives *de facto* have not done away with poverty, and nobody expected that they would. There is no single solution to any social problem.

But what have cooperatives done to relieve poverty, and what untapped possibilities do they still contain?

SOCIALLY APPROVED SELFISHNESS

According to Msgr. Kerby, the economic background of poverty derives from the fact that men are unequal, and "these unequal men, women and children are forced to compete for a living, that is, for property or income. All are thrown upon their own resources and driven into the competitive struggle."⁶ Now, inequalities among men are part of God's plan: "Society cannot exist or be conceived without them."⁷ In a society governed by a thoroughly Christian

philosophy, such inequalities would merely serve as the motive and starting point for acts of charity, mutual aid and cooperation. The desire to compete, too, is natural to man and a force for good when held within bounds; but when glorified as the sole directing principle in social and economic life and fanned by a philosophy of unlimited self-interest, it becomes a disorder which is bound to result in injury to different elements in society.⁸ According to Msgr. Kerby, this has been the case in modern industrial society. Poverty for the most part has not been the result of population pressure, nor of ignorance in the development of resources. Nor has it been a condition in which the "richest was poor, and the poor lived in abundance." Pope Pius XI characterizes our western society as one of "vast differences between the few who hold excessive wealth and the many who live in destitution"—with "the immense number of propertyless wage-earners on the one hand, and the superabundant riches of the fortunate few on the other. . . ."⁹ The distinctive and damning feature of this modern poverty is that it is accepted as the normal and natural outcome of the competitive process: "The essential explanation of modern poverty is to be found in the competitive strug-

⁴ *Rerum Novarum*, par. 4.

⁵ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 65. Cf. speech of Pius XII, Sept., 1944.

⁶ Kerby, Msgr. William J., "The Social Mission of Charity," New York, Macmillan, 1921, p. 11.

⁷ *Rerum Novarum*, par. 38.

⁸ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 95.

⁹ *Ibid.*, pars. 64, 67.

gle carried on among unequals in a spirit of socially approved selfishness."¹⁰

In the individualistic state the restraints of religion, education, legislation and community life have been too mild to curb the ruthless selfishness of the strong. Western society has glorified selfishness and honors the man who has trampled over others to get ahead. Until recently, at least, social philosophy has been colored by the belief that the elimination of the weak in the struggle for survival is the price we must pay for progress; and this philosophy has had a powerful influence upon national policy. "The individualistic state based on the policy of large economic freedom as to contract, enterprise, property, industry, was hindered greatly by its constitution and traditions from curbing the strong or aiding the weak."¹¹ "The state did not hinder the fury of selfishness. Unequals competed. Inequality beyond the law neutralized equality before the law. Poverty is one of the consequences of that process."¹²

Msgr. Kerby considered poverty "in a particular way a problem for the state."¹³ He therefore urged action on the part of the state to temper the competitive struggle. He advocated an extension of the bill of rights, amendment of constitutions to give

the state freer hand, social legislation, and forceful administration of the laws protecting the weak, a reinterpretation of the law of property, and other measures to force upon the strong "a sense of new responsibility toward the working class."¹⁴

This is likewise the teaching of Leo XIII: "Justice, therefore, demands that the interests of the poorer population be carefully watched over by the administration."¹⁵ Pius XI reaffirms Leo's teaching and reemphasizes the obligation of the rulers to "have special regard for the infirm and needy."¹⁶ He then quotes Leo's famous statement that since the wage-earners belong to the mass of the poor who have no resources of their own to fall back upon, "they should be especially cared for and protected by the government."¹⁷

Since these words were written, we have witnessed a pronounced swing away from the social philosophy condemned in the encyclicals—so much so that we are in danger of infringing upon another papal principle, that of subsidiarity. To prevent a swing to the opposite extreme, our society needs many free associations of the people to perform social and economic functions at the lower levels; and cooperatives are just such associations. No matter what some opponents say, they represent the freest sort of enterprise.

¹⁰ Msgr. Kerby, *op. cit.*, p. 12 (Italics mine).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 38.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁵ *Rerum Novarum*, par. 38; cf. par. 41.

¹⁶ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 23.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

They were invented by the common man and are ideally adapted to carrying out group objectives—from getting buried to irrigating alfalfa. The cooperative is a handy, fool-proof instrument by means of which the common people can organize to help themselves.

If it is unrestrained and socially approved competition which threshes the weak out of the economic struggle and huddles them together as the poor,¹⁸ one of the most natural ways to temper the fury of competition is through a form of organization which is its direct antithesis. It is to be remembered that the early co-operators believed that they were building a new cooperative order to replace the competitive system which had used them so roughly. We may not share their enthusiasm for this "new moral world," but we cannot deny that co-operatives can and have established an area in which the competitive struggle is less acute. Instead of setting people against one another, membership in a cooperative brings them together on a basis of mutual aid. No member can gain at the expense of another. It is a case where the gifted and able man voluntarily slows his economic progress, so that all can go forward together. If anyone has special talents he can use them for the advantage of the entire group. Why should men

want only to get richer and richer? Co-ops give men an ideal, an aim, which is not money.

There is also no reason for the cooperative to exploit its members ("cooperatives don't profiteer"), because everything it gains goes back to them. Cooperatives might exploit their employees, but the fact is that those in the Rochdale tradition have taken the lead in giving labor a square deal.¹⁹

COOPERATIVE FELLOWSHIP

The cooperative is an ideal means through which to exemplify the cooperative rather than the competitive spirit in relation to one's fellowmen. Many a social-minded individual—from Robert Owen and Dr. William King to the Rochdale pioneers themselves and thousands of cooperative leaders after them—have found in the cooperative a way in which to serve their neighbor. In every cooperative, everywhere, you will find such selfless leaders giving their time and energy to the building of a people's enterprise. You will find them organizing study clubs, conducting surveys, attending meetings, serving on committees, gathering capital, running a mimeograph machine.

It may be an exaggeration to liken this cooperative fellowship to the supernatural fellowship of the Mys-

¹⁸ Magr. Kerby, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

¹⁹ The People's Year Book (1944) records that on December 15, 1912, the Newastle Cooperative Society in Great Britain presented a check to six employees who had been with the society for over fifty years (p. 121). Not much labor turn-over in British Cooperatives!

tical Body, as some have done, but there can be no question that the cooperative far surpasses individualistic competition as a way to that harmonious proportion in economic life described by Pius XI, where "man's various economic activities combine and unite into one single organism and become members of a common body, lending each other mutual help and service."²⁰ If in the words of Msgr. Kerby "poverty is in the last analysis a spiritual problem, an indication that something has prevented the law of Christian brotherhood from its intended sway in the relations of men,"²¹ "a defeat of the divine brotherhood,"²² one undeniable approach to the problem is through the form of economic organization in which it is easy and natural to exemplify the law of divine brotherhood rather than that of the jungle.

In addition to cushioning the shock of competition upon the weak, cooperatives can also rebuild the lives and develop the personalities of the poor themselves. It can offer them not a springboard but a lifeline out of the valley of poverty. Poverty is a result of a complex of factors; but whatever the original accident or trick of fate which threw the poor into their present predicament, the process is cumulative. The poor "live among themselves, physically, socially and morally

isolated from the strong. They show identical moral, social and industrial traits which are to a great extent the result of poverty as well as the cause of it. Poverty makes the type that we call the poor. The type does not make poverty."²³ Poverty feeds on itself; it is a state of mind as well as a condition. Living conditions, poor food, lack of healthful recreation, inadequate education, and other environmental factors tend to perpetuate the condition and psychology of poverty.

Now the cooperative offers a way to break into this iron circle of cause and effect. It has long been recognized as a means of self-help. On the first page of his *History*, Holyoake says: "The working class are not considered very rich in the quality of self-trust, or mutual trust. . . . The art of creating a large concern, and governing all its complications, is not usually supposed to belong to them."²⁴ But the startling achievement of the poor working classes of Rochdale was to prove that the poor *can* shoulder responsibility and *can* learn to manage very complex enterprises. Cooperatives sponsored among low-income farmers by the Farm Security Administration have demonstrated their character-building value again and again; and the same is true of the cooperative movement in Nova Scotia, Jamaica, Ireland, China and elsewhere.

²⁰ *Quadragesimo Anno*, par. 82; cf. Michel, Virgil, "The Cooperative Movement," *Rural Life Objectives*, 1936, p. 13-18.

²¹ Msgr. Kerby, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 39.

²³ "The Cooperative Movement and the Liturgical Movement," *op. cit.*, p. 43.

²⁴ Holyoake, G. J., *op. cit.*, p. 251.

Active participation in a cooperative does more to develop a man's personality than it does to his pocketbook. It gives him an opportunity to exercise those faculties typical of the human person. People who have been used to taking a back seat and having the law laid down to them, now speak up for themselves. The very fact that the cooperative is *their* organization and that their vote weighs as much as those of the town leaders gives them confidence. They learn to express themselves before a group and take pride in being listened to. They learn to discuss all sides of a question and arrive at a reasonable decision. It is no accident that adult education movements so often go hand in hand with cooperative movements. The latter give the people a means by which to put their learning into immediate use.

Through participation in a cooperative people learn parliamentary procedure and acquire experience in human and social relations on a formal plane. They become acquainted with bookkeeping, balance sheets, legal terms, business practices. They learn to detect the catch in easy payment plans and become aware of the dangers of credit in general. Through credit unions, especially, they learn to escape the deadly embrace of the small loan company. They have an incentive

to use spare time in studying economics, public speaking, bookkeeping, and other subjects. -

Then, if their enterprise succeeds, they will not rest until they have moved on to still more complex undertakings. As these efforts result in solidly established businesses, they acquire a pride of ownership and achievement which is positively deadly to the psychology of poverty.²⁵ Anyone who has had experiences with cooperatives and credit unions among low-income classes can cite hundreds of cases of individual and community rehabilitation directly attributable to participation in a cooperative.

POCKETBOOKS OF THE POOR

Finally, cooperatives *can* do something for the pocketbooks of the poor. The most direct gain is, of course, through the patronage dividend. It is said that the Rochdale Society has saved its members a total of \$25,000,000 in the first hundred years of its existence.²⁶ More impressive than the small but steady stream of refunds are the great merchandising and industrial establishments which have been built up through the years in Great Britain and elsewhere from the difference between the cost of goods and market price. When 1,100 retail societies (several with a membership

²⁵ *Business Week* of March 1, 1941 (p. 36), describes the opening of a new cooperative supermarket by the United Cooperative Society founded by the Finnish weavers in Maynard, Mass. The article emphasizes the pride shown by the members on this occasion: "Witness the Finnish housewife who, at the opening ceremonies, ran her finger down the cashier's counter to pick up dust, just as if she were in her own home—or a neighbor's."

²⁶ *Pennsylvania Co-op Review*, December, 1944, p. 4.

of over 100,000), representing 9,000,000 members, a share capital of over £200,000,000, and an annual trade of £330,000,000, heaped up by a cooperative wholesale which owns factories, ships, plantations, warehouses—when an organization such as this starts throwing its weight around in favor of the common man, something is bound to give. Such resources are used not for individual aggrandizement, but to secure better quality and lower prices for low-income people, and to protect them against monopolies and cartels.

The most obvious way in which the cooperative can benefit the common man is through reducing the costs of distribution, which represent an absurdly large proportion of the price to the consumer, and which show no signs of shrinking. This phase of co-operation has been treated at more length in "Working Together for Freedom."²⁷ The argument there is that because the cooperative is owned by and operated for the members, and because any effort of the members to collaborate with the management in reducing costs will be repaid by an increase in their patronage dividends, the cooperative is able to introduce shortcuts in merchandising which are not possible for the profit retailers. For instance, cooperatives in collaboration with their regional whole-

salers can reduce the number of brands carried, institute grade labeling, reduce expenditures on advertising and use part of the difference for consumer education, instruct members to purchase in larger amounts and at off-peak times when possible, or to wait with a smile when they visit the store or filling station during rush hours. By concentrating a large volume of patronage on each retail unit, members of cooperatives can escape the high costs resulting from the superfluity of retail units and the small volume per unit.²⁸ If there are signs of monopoly or excessive prices in certain lines, the cooperatives through their wholesalers can move into production and squeeze out the excess profits.

A profit dealer has no way of calling forth such cooperation from his patrons ("he's getting paid for it, isn't he?"); but a cooperative is the business of the people. It belongs to them, and whatever they save by using their heads and collaborating with the management will be reflected in their patronage dividend at the end of the period.

So much for the theory—we all know that the reality is not so sublime. The values of cooperation cannot be realized unless the members are filled with the cooperative ideal and participate actively in the

²⁷ Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1945.

²⁸ It is significant that average sales of cooperative filling stations in 1939 were \$34,714 as compared with \$11,760 for all filling stations. Cf. Clark, Lincoln, "The Cooperative Half of One Percent," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Feb., 1942, p. 329.

affairs of the cooperative; and such member participation is not always forthcoming. It is a standing joke in some farming districts that to get a crowd at the annual meeting, a lunch is absolutely essential, and lunch plus movie better still.

INSTITUTIONS OF THE PEOPLE

In England cooperatives have become so large that active participation is possible for only a small fraction of the membership. The Rochdale Society today has 32,000 members and there are 96 societies in Great Britain with a membership of 20,000 or more, and 180 with a membership of 10,000 or more.²⁹ These societies are still operated for the people and remotely controlled by them; but there is little that organizations of such size *can do* that a retail chain *cannot* do. When a society becomes so large, it is hard to see how the common man can develop his personality by participating in its affairs, or gain the self-confidence which comes from being worth his weight in votes.

In this country merchandising by the chains in food lines has become so efficient that it is hazardous to break into the field in which cooperatives have traditionally taken root. The net profit of the leading five grocery chains in prewar years was about two percent on a turn-over of some \$900,-

000,000.³⁰ Such a narrow profit margin on top of very efficient, integrated operations does not offer much inducement.

In addition, farm cooperatives have not always shown a sympathetic attitude toward labor and have been loath to pay salaries which an able man could accept unless accompanied by a good dose of idealism. As one writer put it, "The more I talked to cooperative editors, managers and directors, the more I came to suspect that a great deal of cooperative light and leadership is being hidden under a bushel of shamefully stingy pay checks."³¹ The failure of cooperatives to develop in the East and in regions dominated by the great metropolitan areas is often attributed to farm cooperative leaders' suspicion of organized labor. For that reason the farm cooperatives have been slow to support consumer cooperation or to grasp the consumer viewpoint. Nor, with significant exceptions, have cooperatives developed among the very poor.

On the other hand, whether large or small, whether all members can take an active part or not, cooperatives are still institutions of the people. They will seek to serve and protect the rights of low-income classes; they still offer opportunities for development of personality. They may have a hard time in this country to get a

²⁹ *The People's Year Book*, Manchester, England, 1944, p. 100.

³⁰ Hoffman, A. C., "Large-scale Organization in the Food Industries," *TNEC Monograph*, No. 35. 1940, pp. 8 and 100.

³¹ Rorty, James, "The Co-op David," *The Commonwealth*, Nov. 10, 1944, p. 96.

foothold in the grocery trade, but they have a good start in petroleum and similar lines, where margins were long and there was much room for increasing efficiency.³² And they have been growing like wild-fire in these fields of late. Moreover, the entire monetary gain does not lie in the retailing end. When cooperatives attain such volume that it is feasible to move into production, there are many oppor-

tunities to squeeze out excess profits and to discipline monopolies (e.g., oil and fertilizer) all along the line.

Finally, idealistic as the term "brotherhood economics" may seem to those who have seen the reality, it cannot be denied that the cooperative still offers a most convenient way in which a man can use his talents, not in getting ahead of others, but in getting ahead *with* others.

³² Cf. "Farm Petroleum Delivery," *Bulletin* P52, Iowa State College, 1943.



Parents Make the Future

If the parents of today can give the world young men and women who know where they are going in life; if the parents can give us youths who will enter marriage to do God's will; if we can educate our sons and daughters to marry for love and life; if we can teach them to respect, but not love, money, then, and only then, will we have given the country a generation which will not fall into temptation of escape by divorce. If the parents of today will do this, the world of tomorrow will be a better place to live in. If the parents of today are bad parents, then all the wars and all the leagues of nations, and all the balancing of power, will not make the world a better place. For America and the world will be sick of an internal rot that, like a cancer, will sap the strength of the nation until it becomes a nation of old people futilely trying to stave off disaster, and a nation of young people bent on their own pleasure as they practice the philosophy of "dance and be merry for tomorrow we die." When better worlds are made the parents, who are yesterday's children, will make those worlds.—*Charles J. Sullivan in PRESERVATION OF THE FAITH, August, 1945.*

Minimum Wages

BRIG-GEN. ROBERT WOOD JOHNSON, A.U.S. RET.

AS I understand the purpose of this hearing, it is to discuss the plight of the underpaid. We are not here to consider questions of collective bargaining or those who are earning a fair and adequate wage.

The proposals embodied in the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act are not aimed to raise the general wage level of the United States, but rather they are aimed to correct certain social and economic distress growing out of substandard wages.

There have always been more underpaid employed than unemployed. I suppose it would be fair to estimate that given 6-8 million unemployed, we would in the past expect 15-20 million underpaid.

I suggest that this Committee should take the position that the average American workman cannot keep body and soul together on less than \$30 per week anywhere in the United States. On the basis of a 40-hour week, I, therefore, am compelled to recommend a 75c per hour minimum wage throughout the Nation. On the score of exceptions, and there will be many who dwell exclusively on that feature of the problem, we might assume the exemptions of apprentices, perhaps those under 21 years of age.

Statement by the Chairman of the Board of Johnson and Johnson at the Hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on S. 1349, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, October 23, 1945.

It can be said that a large portion of our underpaid are unmarried and that single individuals can exist on less than \$30 a week. It is well to add, however, that the great majority of single men and women have responsibilities to parents, brothers, sisters, and relatives that are frequently comparable to those of the head of a family.

RELATION OF WAGES TO COST

I suppose it is impossible to discuss any question of wages, even the establishment of fair minimums, without some consideration of the broader economic aspects of the relation of wages to costs. It is a great surprise to me to learn that this outstanding feature of American economy is so little understood.

Some will say that industry moves to low-wage areas. This is a fallacy. Factories move to markets, not to low-wage areas.

We are surrounded every day from morning to night with thousands of

examples that go to prove beyond discussion that the most outstanding characteristic of our country, in terms of economics, has been its accomplishment in the field of production and distribution. On every side we see the proof of the ability of this country to pay higher wages and sell at lower costs. This equation needs no proof beyond the record of the past fifty years.

At times we hear of the loss of export markets through our efforts to correct the substandard wage. Apparently those who oppose reasonable minimums for such reasons have failed to realize that the products able to pay transoceanic freight, overcome tariff walls, pay the high price of export selling, and compete with cheap native labor are almost exclusively the products of our *high-wage industries*.

Of course there are exceptions, and we must acknowledge the fact that the components of industry and commerce differ one from the other. In some industries the wage factor is very low, and in others, it is quite high. But here again I should like to remind the Committee that we are dealing with minimum wages and the plight of the underpaid, the substandard wage earner not reached through union organization, and that his problem cannot be adequately corrected through State legislation. Only a courageous and realistic Federal law can do the job.

It will be better if we come to realize that in discussing this question of a minimum wage, we are covering the field of commerce, industry, services and agriculture. For many years the question of wages has been attached in the public mind to factories and factories alone. I am told that factories have never employed as many as 25 million wage earners, and that in the future the percentage of factory employed in relation to the total employed will probably decline.

While I appreciate that this Committee is giving its attention almost exclusively to the question of minimum wages, it would seem only proper to bring before you that at some later date we must consider the question of hours. I doubt that a 40-hour week will solve our problem, and, therefore, recommend to you that a part of your staff be assigned the task of preparing legislation for a 36-hour week and a 30-hour week. Commerce, industry, the trades and services as well as agriculture would be classified into three major divisions—those operating on a 40-hour week; those, on a 36-hour week; and those, on a 30-hour week.

One method of establishing the work-week for a given business would be the percentage of labor content in the gross cost. In other words, to pick a figure out of the air, if the labor content was in excess of 50 per cent, that business would be given a 40-hour basic week. If under 50 per cent

but above 35, the business would be given a 36-hour week. And if under 35 per cent, the business would be given a 30-hour week. In each instance the same minimum weekly wage of \$30 per week would apply in all three divisions.

For those seasonal industries that cannot rapidly be adjusted to these hours, it is suggested that in any and all divisions business be allowed to operate for any 8-week period during the year at a maximum of 10 hours overtime per week to be paid for at double time. And for those extreme cases which require a further extension for a short period, I offer the suggestion business be allowed an additional 10-hour period for four weeks a year to be paid for at the rate of triple time.

Even today we occasionally meet a man who believes that working less than 48 hours a week is somewhat sacrilegious—that it is wrong in principle. Let us look at the record in this respect.

Throughout most of Christian history, the Western World was influenced by the laws of the Church, and it has been found that in those days the Church allowed about *one hundred holidays a year*. It was only when the industrial era began in England that the sweated days of 14, 16,

and 18 hours came into vogue; and that children were forced to work those hours for starvation wages. We have come a long way since then, but why should we stop now?

What we are really trying to do is to create a new code of business ethics with the aid and guidance of our Federal Government. It would be hard to imagine a more important task nor one that would make a greater contribution to the world. All observers have long ago concluded that it was the underpaid, the unemployed and the destitute of Europe that caused the political upheavals which led to this great war. We have come to a time when we can honestly say, at least in our country, that man does not have the right to employ his fellow man unless he can pay a subsistence wage.

Recently I found that The Rev. Donald A. MacLean said that "*the well-being and perfection of each person is intimately bound up with the welfare of all. Nature has so decreed and there is no other road to the real liberty, the higher welfare, perfection and happiness of men.*"

Someone else has said; "*None but the brave would be able to fashion that future, and none but the brave deserve it.*"

A Message from Stalin

*Reprinted from the New York TIMES**

WHEN Senator Pepper asked Generalissimo Stalin whether he wanted to send him away from his interview with any special message, the Russian leader "hesitated" and then said:

Just judge the Soviet Union objectively. Do not either praise us or scold us. Just know us and judge us as we are and base your estimate of us upon facts and not rumors.

It is an excellent prescription, but how are we to follow it? How are we to "know" Russia, how are we to base our estimate of Russia's purposes and aspirations "upon facts and not rumors," if the Russians themselves discourage us from doing this?

A Russian observer in the United States, whether he is a Soviet journalist or an official of the Soviet Government, can travel wherever he likes, see what he wants to see, talk with anyone he wants to talk with, and send back to Russia, wholly without censorship of any kind, a report on any given situation which is based to the best of his ability "upon facts and not rumors." But this is not true of an American observer in Russia. An American in Russia can travel only where the Government wishes him to travel, see only what he is permitted to see and talk only with people the Government wishes him

to talk with. He cannot separate facts from rumors because the Government will not give him the means to do so. And when, on the basis of evidence which is often insufficient, he prepares his report for transmission to the United States, he must submit it to a heavy-handed censorship which is more interested in the propaganda values than the "objectivity" of his findings.

Moreover, this is true not only throughout the whole territory of the U.S.S.R. It is also true wherever, outside of the U.S.S.R., Russian influence is paramount today. For months our own Government was placed in the humiliating position of begging Russia to permit American newspaper correspondents to go into countries in Eastern Europe—Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, etc.—which had been liberated from German domination with the aid of American arms. Now, when these correspondents have at last been permitted to visit such countries, they find obstacles placed in some cases in the way of transmitting their dispatches. Moreover, what has been happening in Russian-controlled Europe has been happening also in Russian-controlled Asia. The American public is now so thoroughly accus-

* 229 W. 43rd St., New York 18, N. Y., October 2, 1945.

tomed to Russian "blackouts" that it has seemed to be the most natural thing in the world that we should now be told not an inkling of what is happening in Soviet-controlled Korea. The moment the Soviet armies occupied Manchuria, the inevitable headline read: "Soviet Blackout in Manchuria."

Why does Generalissimo Stalin's Government pursue this policy, if Stalin himself really wants us to "judge the Soviet Union objectively," if he really wants us to "know" Russia, if he really wants us to "judge the Russians as they are" and "base our estimates of them upon facts and not rumors?"

This policy defeats its own purposes. Inevitably it feeds rumors instead of clearing them away. It creates suspicions. It handicaps good relations. It makes difficult certain actions which would otherwise be simple. When, for example, the American people are asked to make a very large loan to

Russia, it is natural that they should want to be in the position of acquiring as much knowledge about Russia and Russian policies as any prudent private creditor would desire in similar circumstances. Certainly in private transactions of this kind full and willingly granted access to all relevant information is the *sine qua non* of extending credit. Present Russian policy does not encourage the acquisition of such information. It does not encourage that mutual confidence which alone can serve as a sound basis for the pooling of Russian and American efforts in such matters, for example, as control of offensive weapons like the atomic bomb.

Probably nothing else in the world is so important at this moment as good relations between Russia and the United States. Probably nothing would do so much to promote and cement those good relations as an end of Russian blackouts, foreign and domestic.

THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse
With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll
BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.